

Medal; and the National Defense Service Medal.

Major Rushworth now resides at Edwards Air Force Base with his wife, the former Joyce Butler of Norridgewock, Maine, and 6-year-old daughter, Cherl.

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the great measure of pride that Major Rushworth's attainments have brought to his wife, his daughter, and his mother.

I want to take this opportunity of joining with a legion of others in saluting Major Rushworth and extending to this distinguished son of Maine my very warm congratulations on his latest achievement at the threshold of space.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CUBA AND THE COLD WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] is recognized for 2 hours.

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 years since the Moncado episode in Cuba. Castro has taken over the island and has failed to carry out a single one of the pledges he made at that particular time. Today we are on the brink of signing a test-ban treaty.

Lest we forget what has happened in the Western Hemisphere, Members of both sides of the aisle are joined together today to present a discussion of the cold war and Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] and I are acting as coordinators for other Members on both sides of the aisle to present to the Members of the House a series of talks on a concerted plan to help fight the cold war and to win back Cuba for democracy. Our purpose is, first, to alert the American public to this problem and, second, to let Latin America know that we in Congress truly care about the fate of our sister nation, Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we shall review many actions taken in the past in relation to Cuba and make recommendations for a coordinated future program for our allies in the Western Hemisphere. We shall present a varied program which is bipartisan in nature and is not meant to be one of lambasting and whipping over the history and the personalities of the past involved in the present posture of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we shall recognize speakers who have previously requested time. It is then our intention to recognize all of those who wish to be heard during the coming hours.

At the conclusion of the speeches the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] and I shall review for you some of the significant features of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH].

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] for this opportunity to present a few comments on a serious subject that affects not only the security of the Americas but indeed the security of the world.

Mr. Speaker, only a hasty glance at the headlines of the current newspapers is necessary to find testimony of the relentless drive of the Sino-Soviet empire for world conquest. This steady march for world domination has continued for nearly a half-century. Having crushed Tibet the Red dragon of China sits astride countless miles of the territory of India. Along the banks of the Mekong River in South Vietnam can be heard the ugly chatter of machine-guns where there is being waged a war that is both brutal and vicious and not so cold. Yet it is along the banks of the Mekong River that could well be determined the future of all southeast Asia. Never for a single moment have the Soviets ceased in their relentless determination to ring down on freedom's lonely stage the iron curtain of Red slavery in Berlin. The Red standard that flies from over a dozen capitals of Eurasia has now been firmly planted in the Caribbean where it is intended to be a beachhead for a revolutionary assault upon all of Latin America, a revolutionary assault that will be waged not only militarily but, rather, will be waged psychologically, economically, and politically, where in the arsenal of their weaponry will be espionage, subversion, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, terrorism, and violence.

Mr. Speaker, on the Cuban island there are being trained revolutionaries who study the guerrilla doctrines of Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh, and Che Guevarra. Here are being trained the guerrillas to infiltrate Latin America and wage there a form of warfare that was waged by the Castro movement in the late fifties so successfully.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets placed their missiles on the Cuban island and this Nation, scarcely 10 months ago, was confronted with a situation of deadly peril. Militarily, there was sought to be changed the balance of power in nuclear weaponry. Last fall we discovered that there were on the Cuban island missiles undoubtedly intended for American targets.

Mr. Speaker, the world was apprehensive during our quarantine and the resulting confrontation; America was proud of the bold and decisive and courageous action that was taken so successfully at that time, with the full support of the American people, and in cooperation with our allies including the Organization of American States.

However, the strategy directed at Cuba by the Soviets was not just in the military arena using missiles but, rather, it is twofold. The second phase of that

strategy is continuing now in the same relentless methods of conquest so characteristic of the international Communist conspiracy.

It is this second form of strategy—the subversion of Latin America from a Cuban base—that we need to be concerned about, which poses now a real threat to the security of all the Americas.

Yet the Cuban situation is not a partisan issue; it is not an issue of any party, but, rather, it is an issue that should be discussed bipartisanship to form a concerted action for those who seek to preserve and extend the boundaries of freedom.

The issue is really freedom versus slavery, for now we see the colonial power of the Soviet Union intervening and denying to the Cuban people the right of self-determination, the Soviet Union seeking to enforce their rule through the police state by stationing Russian troops on the island who might employ in Havana the tactics learned in Budapest.

This is our challenge, it is a challenge to all Americans. It is not a party challenge, because it is one that each of us must meet, indeed we must meet it not only for the freedom of this Nation, but indeed for a free world.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania again for permitting me to make these remarks.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for the fine background for our discussion today on the cold war and Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am pleased to join with the other Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle in a very bipartisan approach to this problem, one that does concern the American people. As we consider this problem of Cuba and what has been done and what should be done, the American people will be impressed with the fact that it is not just Members of Congress from Florida who are concerned about this problem but there are Members from Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, on the other side of this country, California, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Minnesota, and Kansas who are concerned. As a matter of fact, all States in this union are concerned.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to generate the concern and to start the leadership in many lines necessary to get rid of Castro and communism in this hemisphere. Of course, there are two approaches: unilateral action by the United States alone as well as multilateral action through the Organization of American States.

May I say, as I have tried to say many times before on the floor of this House, multilateral action comes only after unilateral leadership by the United States. The greatest example of multilateral action following strong leadership or unilateral action by our country was what took place in October 1962, when the President set up embargoes on Cuba and immediately and for the first time we had 100 percent cooperation, a

joinder by the Organization of American States.

One of the things I have been concerned with particularly is the economic action that can be taken against Castro. This is a field that I think can bring immediate hurt to Castro and communism, can make Russia's task so much more expensive and so much more difficult that it helps to destroy the reason for Russia even being concerned with Cuba. Furthermore I think by sealing off Cuba in this hemisphere, as can be done, that this would destroy the very reason for Russia being there. If we can prevent the travel to and from Cuba, if we can prevent the transfer of funds throughout the hemisphere to Cuba, if we can cut off telecommunications between Cuba and the rest of the hemisphere, then the very reason for Russia having their people there, which is to subvert the rest of the hemisphere, would be destroyed, and I think that is the very first step to be taken by this Nation and the nations of this hemisphere.

I am concerned about Allied shipping into Cuba. In January of this year the shipping from our well-known allies was down to about 12 ships, but since that time we have seen an increase in this shipping until last May it was up to about 44, and in June it was up to about 38 or 39 from the latest reports, and it is possible that even those reports can increase because many of the intelligence sources that come in and are checked out require some time. At any rate we are seeing a steady increase in Allied shipping again back into Cuba which simply takes the burden off of Russia in using its own ships to come in and supply the goods that are very necessary for this Cuban island to exist. So the lifeblood and the method of feeding communism into Cuba right now is being carried on by such of our supposedly good friends as Britain and many other nations, people who have professed great friendship with us and yet are letting their own ships be used to carry on this policy of undermining the very purposes of freedom in this hemisphere and undermining the policies of our own Government.

Mr. DEVINE. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield in order that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WEAVER. Would the gentleman from Florida care to yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield for a question.

Mr. WEAVER. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Florida. I have seen him in the well and time and time again in this session of Congress on this very subject. I know he is vitally interested due to the proximity of his district to the island of Cuba, that here as he said is a bipartisan problem that should be faced directly. The gentleman from Florida has been a consistent fighter in this regard. I might say just last weekend a group, a task force from this side of the aisle, directed a letter to the administration on

the very subject on which the gentleman is talking, and I wish again to compliment him on his continued fight for what is a solid American principle.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and appreciate, too, his continued interest in trying to do something about this problem of Cuba. I was delighted to see the letter that was sent to try to encourage stronger action in cutting off this shipping. I would like to ask all Members who are concerned to join me in sponsorship of this bill that I introduced a number of days back, H.R. 7687, which has as its purpose, in effect, the closing of American ports to the ships of any nation which allows any of its ships to go into Cuba. This is the only way we are going to be able to cut it off. Halfway measures are not going to work. We have seen our Government make representations to some of these so-called allies and other friends of ours, asking them, "Won't you please cut off your shipping to stop Russia from building up Cuba? Won't you please stop your shipping to Cuba?"

They say, "Oh, well, we would like to help you, but somehow we just can't go this far."

The administration took a halfway step in saying that any ship that goes into Cuba cannot come into an American port after that for 120 days. Well, it is very easy to get around that. They simply let one ship do that while all the other ships come into American ports and carry on all the trade they want to.

I think we ought to let them make a quick decision as to whether they want to trade with the United States of America or whether they want to trade with Russia and Cuba. The best way to do it is for the Congress itself to take action; to say that this is the congressional intent, this is going to be the law, this is what we want done. We want our American ports closed to any ship from any nation if it permits any one of its ships to go into Cuba carrying these Russian goods.

The Congress can do this. And I solicit the support, as I am sure we have it here in the Congress, of other Members to unite in joint sponsorship of this approach. Let us pass a law to cut off this shipping. Let them quickly make their decision, and I am sure it will be quickly done, because any country which has large trade with the United States will make that decision very quickly; because all of the trade to Cuba represents only about 1 percent of their trade. And yet look what it is doing in taking the burden away from Russia.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things I think we can do in the Congress quickly to show our intent, just as we did when we passed that bill some time back, when we said that we wanted to prevent Cuban goods from coming into this country. When this House unanimously passed that bill, immediately after, even though it did not have a chance to pass the Senate because it was in the closing days of the last Congress, the Executive immediately recognized the intent of the congressional bill and cut off that trade. So we can direct

policy here by taking some positive action. The American people want it.

I certainly want to compliment all of my colleagues from all over this country who are sufficiently concerned about this problem to speak up and to demand some action and some leadership to get rid of Castro and communism in this hemisphere.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida who has been a champion from the very beginning of action on Cuba. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] for spearheading this discussion today to offer some constructive proposals and ideas to do something about the deplorable situation in Cuba.

I am particularly pleased to see my colleagues from both sides of the aisle entering into this discussion, opening it up for review in the way they have. I think the American people are more concerned, more deeply concerned, with this situation that faces us in Cuba and in fact around the world, than they are with any other problem with which this country is faced today. The American people want some positive action here. I think the people around the world are watching the United States to see what we are going to do.

This is not just a Communist buildup in Cuba. It is not just a threat to the United States that we are talking about, but this is a threat to the entire free world. I think that the prestige of America started into a sharp decline at the time we allowed the Russians to build up their Communist foothold in this hemisphere. I think this is well demonstrated by the fact that Mr. de Gaulle now wants to build up his nuclear force in France. If America does not have the guts and the willingness to stand up for freedom when communism is established 90 miles off our shores, are we going to have guts enough to stand up and help the countries of Europe when the Russians push communism into their countries? I do not blame Mr. de Gaulle. If I were in France or in any other free country I think I would take a second look at it, too, when we say we are for freedom and yet allow the Communists to establish the foothold that they now have in Cuba.

I think the American people are correct in saying that they are tired of this business of being concerned with how popular we are instead of how right we are, and they, as do I, believe that the Kennedy brothers ought to get as tough with Castro and communism as they did with the American steel industry.

I, along with many of my colleagues, have, for over a year, recommended positive action in Cuba by establishing an economic blockade of Cuba, initiation of hard-hitting negotiations with our Allies to stop trade and aid to Cuba, and the recognition of a free-Cuban Gov-

ernment in exile, including the granting of technological and military assistance if necessary to help the Cuban people regain freedom.

We could squeeze out the Castro-Communist government now, and without war, if we would initiate action immediately, but if we allow Castro to continue to build up his military strength and the Russians to solidify their position in this hemisphere, we could be forced into war to rid ourselves of this Communist threat on our southern shores.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity of taking part in this discussion and I commend my colleagues for bringing it to the attention of the American public in the very constructive manner they have today.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN].

(Mr. BROTZMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join this discussion with a sense of great responsibility—also urgency. Responsibility, because I believe to be born free is an accident, to live free is a responsibility, to die free is an obligation; urgency, because our Nation is involved in a cold war that can be just as deadly to the noble purposes of our Government as that type of conflict proclaimed by flaming muzzles and screaming bombs.

We as a nation spend billions of dollars on defense, following our policy of deterrence through strength, a policy which I support. But each of us must be aware that this deterrence keeps an arena of combat open. This is an arena where the fight is for the hearts and minds of men, and this battle is being waged around the clock. This is a fight where the weapons of our opponents are subversion, propaganda, lies, and brutality—anything to obtain their objectives.

As a Congressman I receive much mail from my constituents decrying our lack of foreign policy, or, in the alternative, frustration over our schizophrenic policy. We are supporting a coalition with Communists in Laos, yet we fight against Communists in Vietnam. The administration vows determinedly to rid the Western Hemisphere of Communist domination, yet we erect insurmountable obstacles against anti-Castro forces who want to rid themselves of this savage, godless ideology.

In making these remarks and joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, my intention is to make constructive and affirmative suggestions concerning ways in which I believe our policy can be made realistic, can be made effective and demonstrative of the leadership we must assume. In this context I object strongly to a statement recently made by Mr. McGeorge Bundy, the Presidential adviser on foreign policy.

Speaking on a panel conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and referring to Cuba, Mr. Bundy said:

Honest critics should say whether they prefer these acts of war to the Kennedy policy.

Implicit in this statement is the assumption that there is no action that can be taken, no alternative, no improvements made between our "wait and see" policy and war. I submit that a positive, affirmative program in this area would lessen the chances of war, not increase them. I further submit that this "all or nothing" approach of Mr. Bundy's does a disservice to the cause of building a sound, effective Cuban policy, free from unbridled partisanship.

Last April, Freedom House, in collaboration with the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, brought together a group of nonpartisan experts who studied the Cuban problem. One conclusion of that group bears directly on this subject:

The net effect of examining such factors is to suggest that a simple policy of risk avoidance can lead only to the certainty of a worsening position for the United States. Indeed, it is more likely that an improvement of our position will occur only from a process of intelligent risk taking. This was demonstrated in the October confrontation. The administration took manageable risks rather than accept the certainty that the nuclear balance would swing in Russia's direction and that Khrushchev's capability for blackmail and attack would be increased by the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba. Unfortunately, while it was clearly willing to take risks in order to obtain a Soviet pledge of an inspected withdrawal of the missiles, there was not willingness to take the risk of a follow through. Is there any practical value in running risks to gain a pledge, and running no risks to enforce it?

A brief look at any map or globe clearly shows the importance of the island of Cuba in relation to the challenge that faces the United States, the Western Hemisphere, and the free world. The important cities and military installations of the United States mainland are now open to Soviet attack by conventional weapons, eliminating the necessity for building large stores of long range Russian weapons.

The island's proximity to the United States makes it an ideal base from which our radio and television frequencies can be jammed. Evidence indicates the strong possibility that Cuba is already being used as a base for Russian submarines. But of equal importance, or perhaps of more importance at this juncture of American history, is the obvious fact that this island is a launching pad for subversion for the entire Western Hemisphere, and particularly for Central and South America.

The evidence is also overwhelming that Cuba is being used as a training school for subversion. An 8-nation committee of the Organization of American States recently wrote a 60-page report proving the existence of this threat and describing the extent of its progress. The report states:

Undoubtedly Cuba now constitutes the regional center for subversive action by international communism in America.

The report adds:

It is no exaggeration to say that Cuba has now been converted into a Soviet military camp. It is also clear that Cuba is being used as a base for training in communism and for the spread of communism.

Pedro G. Beltran, former Prime Minister of Peru, recently gave a vivid picture of the results of this increase in subversion coming from Cuba. Speaking before the Catholic Press Association of the United States and Canada, he said:

Cuba has thus become a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas. The Communists are mounting an attack on our countries from within. How can you expect to control this sort of indoctrination and infiltration? The boys who are taken to Cuba, whether from Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador or any of these countries, need no passport in order to travel. Once they are over the border, Castro agents furnish them with money and transportation. They are welcomed to Havana without documents and when they leave they are provided with forged passports which do not mention their stay in Cuba. Certainly they will not return home through regular channels. The fact is that as long as the Russians are in Cuba, it will continue to be a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas.

The same story of subversion can be written about any Latin America country. The OAS report I referred to before estimates that there are now more than 250,000 Communist Party members in Latin America. Of these, only about 60,000 are reported to be in Cuba.

There are many changes in policy that would, in my opinion, strengthen our world position, reestablish our leadership in the Western Hemisphere, and which would remove "Subversion University" from our back doorstep.

First, it is imperative that we as a people, and as a government, put ourselves unequivocally and unflinchingly on the side of the Cuban people who are willing to fight for their freedom. I recently talked to a large number of political exiles at Guantanamo Naval Base. Their message was clear and convincing:

Help us get Khrushchev out of Cuba and we will take care of Castro ourselves.

It is unfortunate that it is necessary for this Nation to make a declaration such as this, measured against the principles of liberty that presided at our birth and that have been our heritage. There should be no question that we support those who fight for freedom and oppose those who live and rule by tyranny. This has always been our national purpose.

I suggest that this evening you go down to Haines Point and read the firm, unequivocal pledge of Thomas Jefferson, inscribed in that magnificent memorial, for all to see and savor:

I have sworn upon the altar of God Eternal, hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Unfortunately, our past actions regarding Cuba bear bitter fruit. The abandonment of our demands for on-site inspections, the apparent willingness to accommodate ourselves to Communist control of Cuba, the chastisement of Cuban exile groups, the forsaking of the clear-cut intent and meaning of the Monroe Doctrine—all these individual actions form a composite picture that leaves serious doubt as to how far we will actually go to defend freedom in this hemisphere.

Such a declaration of support for those Cuban patriots would serve notice to the world that we are ready to reassume the robes of leadership. It would do much more—it would serve notice to those brave Cuban people that they do not fight alone and that their cause does not go unnoticed at our counsel tables.

One of the great shortcomings of our foreign policy has been our apparent ignorance or disregard of the undeniable fact that there is in progress today, at this very moment, an impressive revolt in Cuba. The Castro movement has failed utterly and miserably to capture the support of the Cuban people. Cuba was not a case of "stomach communism" initially as many people mistakenly believe. Rather, Castro's rise to power and with him communism, was caused by the middle and upper classes being willing to accept the benefits of freedom without assuming the attendant responsibilities. It seems inconceivable that our foreign policy architects, do not appreciate fully the valiant struggle being waged every hour around the clock by Cuban peasants and patriots, yet no evidence of that awareness is manifest. These Cuban liberty fighters desperately need physical help—food, arms, ammunition—the tools of guerrilla warfare. In the absence of that help, they are equally desperate for our moral support. They need to know that in spirit we are fighting by their side, yet they have not received that assurance.

The story of those fighting for freedom in Cuba, a David and Goliath battle, is an inspiring one. In order to put this story into proper perspective, I think we must look at the earlier Castro-led revolution. It is not correct to assume that the pre-Castro Cuba was a nation of impoverished peasants, on the brink of mass revolt. This is a beguiling notion, but it simply is not right. Pre-Castro Cuba was no paradise, no home of economic and social democracy, but neither was it a sink of poverty and misery. Its per capita income was much higher than that of post-war Japan and about on a par with post-war Italy. Many of these peasants no doubt were misled by the demagogic Castro who represented that they were at that time fighting for their individual liberty, when in fact the Communist conspiracy was lurking in the wings.

Cuban resistance started almost the day the true facts were known. As early as December 14, 1960, Castro proudly announced that all counter revolutionaries had been wiped out. He has made the same claim several times in the past 2 years. Yet the current revolt persists and grows in size.

Castro himself is authority for the proof of its growth. On June 18 and again on June 27 of this year, he announced that half the counterrevolutionary bands in one province had been eliminated—14 in number. Accepting Castro's statement at face value, simple mathematics indicate 14 bands of patriots remain in this single province—and there are 6 other provinces in Cuba.

The story of this sabotage is revealed in cold facts. Listed below are the sugar production figures for the last 6 years:

	[In tons]
1958-----	5,610,600
1959-----	5,788,100
1960-----	5,688,900
1961-----	6,567,800
1962-----	4,693,100
1963 (estimated)-----	3,000,000

Castro first came to power in January 1959. Only seven sugar mills were seized by him in this year, so most of the sugar was produced under private industry. In 1960, following the harvest, Castro confiscated all the mills, and in 1961 he declared free operation—no quotas—and every stalk of cane was cut. Consequently, the 1962 crop, harvested in 1963, was the first Communist sugar harvest. That crop was less than half the peak production of 1961.

The means by which this reduction in production occurred is a story of courage and ingenuity. Much of the sabotage has been accomplished through the elementary process of setting the canefields on fire. One successful technique is a vignette of persistence. The peasants catch rats, tie a rag to the tail, soak it in gasoline, set it afire and send the rat scurrying through the fields. The immediate result? As if by magic a series of fires will spring up in various parts of the fields, destroying sugar. The long-range result? Another blow to Communist control.

The government of Las Villas Province recently admitted that 5 million arrobas of cane had been burned. Since one arroba equals 25 pounds of sugar, the sabotage efforts of Cuban peasants in a single province translate into 125 million pounds of sugar.

Another means of sabotage used by counterrevolutionaries is the simple technique of refusing to work. The effect of this "stay away" strike is most apparent in the operation of the sugar grinding machinery. Once the grinding machine starts during the sugar season it is necessary that it stay in constant operation day and night until the grinding is completed. It becomes economically prohibitive to start and stop the machines. Yet the reports of delays that are heard over the Communist radio network tell the story of Communist failure. For a single example, this report was heard from Dos Amigas in Oriente Province:

Closed. Time lost, 24 hours. Reason: no cane cutters.

Total time lost for February and March, 500 hours.

Each of these delays, and there are hundreds of them, demonstrate the failure of the Communist Party to terrorize the Cuban peasant into submission. Conversely, it is notice to all who will look, that these people are fighting and will continue fighting tyranny.

Testimony to the success of the revolt comes from the top Cuban officials themselves. Rigoberto Fernandes, the head of the regime's so-called "labor service" said that even the "volunteers" were sabotaging the canefields. "It is necessary to rotate volunteer sugarcane cutters and laborers, then put others who do not resist to cutting the cane. We will not continue the dangers that cause the loss of grinding of sugar and put our revolution in danger," he stated.

Communist Party Secretary Felipe Torres said:

Volunteers are deserting their labor and even those staying in the canefields are refusing to work.

On April 30, 1963, Minister of Industry Ernesto Guevara described the frustration that besets the Communist leaders when he stated almost plaintively:

We must look carefully to find out where the cane cutters have deserted to.

No less than Raul Castro has said:

We have an economic problem of the greatest nature. The regime mobilized 50,000 workers from other jobs and sent them to the fields as permanent volunteer cane cutters but despite their help and despite everything we have not been able to maintain normal sugar grinding.

Finally I cite the bearded leader, Fidel Castro made the following statement on return from his recent visit to Russia. It takes no great insight to imagine the conversation between Castro and Khrushchev that prompted this remark:

We have not complied with our sugar commitments for various reasons, known to all of us. We have an unfavorable trade balance of \$200 million a year.

The same story of sabotage can be written concerning the other Cuban crops. In 1958 the tobacco production was 628 million units for export and domestic consumption. In 1959, Castro's first year of power, production fell to 322 million units and exports fell from 79.8 million to 69.8 million units. In 1960, exports dropped to 54.6 million units, and in 1961 they fell to 32.7 million units. An article in Cuba Socialista, an official government magazine, said:

The export of cheap tobacco has fallen during 1961 and 1962 to a level of about 33 million cigars with a value of only \$6 million.

The production of coffee is not a major crop for Cuba, but an interesting story lies in this area. Coffee is produced in the mountainous region of Cuba, best suited to counterrevolutionary activities. At first, the peasants broke the limbs off the coffee trees and production dropped to almost nothing. Consequently, the Castro government has moved these people to the collective farms on the plains and sent city workers to the mountains. They still are not trusting of them, however, so they work in groups of not larger than 10. Of the 10 workers, the No. 1 worker is a government man, the No. 2 is a Cuban G-2 employee, and the third is a Young Communist. The production of coffee has not increased despite these measures.

Even in this sea of heartbreak, there are islands of humor, caused by the Communist frustration. Recently this story appeared in the Communist Cuban paper "Hay." The column called "A Thousand Eyes" reports that a comrade on duty in a warehouse was cleaning his boots. He was using gasoline. Then he lit a cigarette and inadvertently threw the lighted match directly into the gas can, causing a fire of \$100,000 magnitude. The article tersely cautioned against such negligence.

If there is a doubt about the effectiveness of this sabotage activity by the Cuban people, consider Castro's repressive order 988:

Anyone caught burning cane, giving one mouthful of food to Cuban revolutionary bands or giving assistance to guerrilla bands is to be shot within 48 hours.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have today written a letter to Secretary of State Rusk as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Evidence clearly shows that Cuban patriots are in an impressive stage of revolt against Castro's Communist government. Will you send to me the nonclassified mass of evidence your Department has compiled, detailing the extent of this revolt? I also ask that you make this information available to the people of the United States and to the world. I make this request for the following reasons:

1. Freedom's fight, whether it be heralded by the boom of cannons on the battlefield, or the lonely stillness of sabotage and guerrilla warfare, should be told. The world should know when there is concerted, effective opposition to the Communist conspiracy.

2. Those Cubans who are fighting need to know that you and the American people are aware of their valiant efforts. Since last October we have not indicated by our actions that their fight is our fight.

3. The people of the Latin American countries who are subjected to Communist subversions with ever-increasing intensity should know what their Cuban neighbors, already under the Soviet fist, are doing to rid themselves of its punishment. They will be awakened to the danger before it is too late.

4. The American people should know the fight is being waged. We need desperately to affirm our determined opposition to Soviet intrusion in our hemisphere. Our "wait and see" policy, coupled with prominent domestic issues have driven the Cuban problem from the front pages. Yet who can deny the stake the American people have in a correct solution? You and I am working for them—they have a right to know.

5. This disclosure, accompanied by the firm declaration that we are on the side of the Cuban people fighting Castro will serve notice to the world that we are ready to re-assume leadership for the cause of liberty, freedom, and dignity of man.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] and those who have joined in continuing the call the attention of the Congress and the American people to the dangers of a Communist base existing here in the Western Hemisphere. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] who just concluded, called to the attention of the House a report issued recently by the Organization of American States.

I would like to remind the gentleman and the Congress of the hearings conducted in February and early March by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Castro-Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere and the report that was issued following those hearings. In that report, the subcommittee members pointed out that while

Latin America has been a target for Communist conquest since the early 1920's with the coming into power of Fidel Castro in Cuba in 1959 the existence of an operational base in the heartland of the Americas brought a grave new dimension to the Communist threat to the Inter-American system.

From its inception the Castro regime has sought to export revolution to other countries of the hemisphere. Direct military efforts, in the form of small rebel force landings in the hemisphere, failed in 1959. Cuba then rapidly became a base for subversion and guerrilla training, as well as propaganda campaigns aimed at the overthrow of existent Latin American governments.

By 1960, Soviet and outside Communist influence and control over the Castro revolutionary apparatus had become obvious. In December 1961, when the Cuban dictator proclaimed his allegiance to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, his appeal to indigenous non-Communist elements in Latin America diminished, but the campaign to export revolution by subversive aggression was intensified.

This stepped-up campaign continues to be carried out by three basic means: First, exploitation of nationalist and ultra leftist groups; second, the dissemination of propaganda; and, third, the intensive ideological indoctrination and development of antigovernment forces through guerrilla training.

These and other observations are contained in the subcommittee's report, which I mentioned a few moments ago, as well as recommendations which subcommittee members felt would be helpful in combating subversive activities throughout the hemisphere. I commend to the Members of the House both the printed hearings on Castro-Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere, and the report that followed those hearings.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] for yielding me this time.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one comment?

Mr. WEAVER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I just want to say I know of no Member who has been more diligent in trying to do something about this Cuban problem than the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]. His work, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is a position where he has been able to become knowledgeable on what is being done and what is not being done, and certainly his leadership has been helpful in trying to bring some positive policy into so many things that need to be done. I certainly want to join with other Members of the House in commending his strong interest and leadership.

Mr. WEAVER. I too commend the gentleman from Alabama for his leadership and wise comment on this subject.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one comment?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. The other day when Castro announced he was going to confiscate our Embassy I checked with the State Department to find out whether any such attack had ever been made on any of our Embassies. They came up with the report that only in one instance was it done, in Vietnam when the Japanese moved in, they did take over temporarily our Embassy in Saigon. However, in no other case did it happen. The Germans did not bother our Embassy during the war. The Italians did not bother it and neither did the Japanese in Tokyo. Even the Chinese have not made a move at all toward our Embassy. It seems to me this is a direct attack on the United States just the same as if they attacked Miami, or Washington, or any other part of the United States, because that Embassy is the United States.

I certainly regret that our President and our Secretary of State have not made a very strong and determined effort to see that if this confiscation is going to proceed, then I think we have to take some direct action.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from California for his observations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] be yielded 40 minutes so he may in turn yield to other Members of Congress on the subject of the cold war in Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] for yielding me this time. I want to compliment my colleagues for the very forceful and certainly the very nonpartisan attitude that has been displayed here this afternoon in discussing this problem which is not just a problem of this administration or of Florida, or of the United States, but is a problem of the whole free world. It is not just a problem of our State Department, nor of the Senate of the United States, but it is also a problem of this body. It behooves all of us to use our most constructive thoughts and to manage our time so that we will bring to bear on this most sensitive subject and on this most important subject the best thoughts of this body. It is with this in mind that I make a few remarks before I yield, about the possibilities and the probabilities and the desirabilities of recognizing a provisional government, or a government in exile to represent the Cuban people during this very strenuous time. I know that many people have said that this is an unwise decision to make; that we should not get involved with any group of refugees, or with any other people in trying to set up some government to represent them while Castro is in power.

But after having read all of their arguments and after having read the arguments on the other side, and based upon some personal experience that I have had in working in this type of situation

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be most wise and most desirable for this country to recognize some provisional government to represent these exiles and to represent the people inside of Cuba who are seeking freedom. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a step toward unity.

I know that in the city of Miami there are as many as 25 different exile groups, freedom-loving groups that need direction and maintenance and stability. I know in my own city there are freedom-loving groups of Cuban refugees and first generation Cubans who would like to work together in throwing off Castroism in our hemisphere. But all of these people seem to be milling around and looking to someone else for leadership. I say that that leadership must be found within them; it is within the people who are now temporary visitors in our country as exiles and the people who are fighting inside of Cuba, as Mr. BROZMAN so ably pointed out, who will have to bring some direction and some stability to this movement.

Of course, it would be much better if we could recognize a provisional government inside of Cuba. Maybe a few months or a few years ago this would have been possible, but it will not help us at all today to think about the past. We must think about the future. If it is impossible, and it is probably impossible, to recognize this provisional government in exile on the island of Cuba, certainly we should assist these people to try to set up under some democratic process here in this country or in one of the other Latin-American countries, a unified front to oppose Castro. This provisional government would include within its people who are now on the island of Cuba and those who are now outside the island of Cuba. A provisional government would help in establishing a sound situation in Cuba after Castro leaves or after we have run Castro out of that area. It could set out clearly the aims and the objectives and the principles for which a new and free Cuba would stand. It could set forth what would be done about bringing about a firmer economy on the island of Cuba; what would be done about free elections in Cuba; what would be done about the whole cause of freedom in Cuba. A provisional government could establish a positive ideological attack upon this cancer that resides in the island.

This government in exile or this provisional government, once set up, could establish through democratic processes its own leaders. It could, by the use of means of communication, radio and printed material, take the message of freedom and coordinate the message of freedom and fight for freedom on the island. It would be such an agency to which this country could legitimately under international law and under the laws of this country render substantial economic and military aid.

But all this would not be enough. In addition to this, it is my thought that we in the Congress and we in America must think about what is going to happen once we get rid of Castro.

I believe that the whole area of Central and South America, as was ably pointed out in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs this last February and March, is ripe for revolution. It is no longer a question of supplying South Americans with the guns, arms, and ammunition to carry on a revolution, because about 65 very violent and semiviolent revolutions have occurred in Central and South America since the end of World War II and they already have all of the arms and ammunition that they need.

From reading the hearings and listening to the testimony of Mr. John McCone, Mr. Martin, and others, it is obvious that the Central and South American people already have the guns to carry on any kind of revolution they want to. But we have arms enough here in our country to prevent the spread of communism into Central and South America, but the real question is, Do we have the ideological strength, do we have the determination to keep communism out of Central and South America? I think we do, but I think we need to take constructive steps to keep it out.

One of the constructive steps I should like to suggest would be a vast speedy and expansion of our cultural and educational exchange program in Central and South America. I know that through the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the State Department we are now carrying on these programs, but the programs unfortunately are not enough. They are not adequately financed, and that is the responsibility of this Congress.

It seems to me we can also introduce a new program, a program designed to get very quickly to the minds and the hearts of the future leaders of Central and South America by establishing a program that would go to the educators, the teachers, the instructors particularly in the secondary schools of Central and South America, to bring them to this country in an exchange program. We have brought college professors here with some success, but let us bring the secondary teachers here to demonstrate to them how freedom works in our country, to help them take the message of freedom and a free economy back to those very fine minds that are in the secondary schools in the Americas.

We have seen through the American Field Services Program demonstrated in this country the fine exchange program where students come here from all over the world as well as the Americas to live in the homes of America. I have seen this is a very wonderful program in action. I urge the continuation, the reinforcement, and the expansion of this type of program. We can invite those students of high school age, high school seniors particularly, before they go to college, to live here, to see freedom as it actually works, to live in American homes. I know there are many American homes that will welcome the students and have welcomed them. In this way we will have an opportunity of planting in the minds of these future leaders the spirit of our wonderful American revolution of freedom and equality.

I am ashamed to say that in a nation where we can sell soap, cigarettes, whiskey, and other things better than any other nation in the world yet we have neglected the opportunity to sell the message of the wonderful American revolution, this freedom revolution, throughout the world, and particularly throughout Central and South America. It chagrins me to recognize that while we are militarily strong and yet we are not ideologically strong and have not used our ingenuity and our wealth to spread this message of freedom.

We, the Congress, have failed to give to the USIA, for instance, sufficient money for its needs. Yet we spend more money for one nuclear submarine than we spend on the whole information and education program throughout the world of spreading this idea of what Americanism and what freedom really is. I think we need to change this approach. We must step up our program of information, education, and cultural exchange with the Americas. We can do this by bringing in more Latin American students and teachers and sending them more of our students and teachers. We must also step up our program in the Americas for the ideological attack for freedom through the USIA and other agencies.

The responsibility of supporting these programs and for creating new ones rest with this Congress. We must not fail.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding at this point.

Mr. Speaker, Cuba's economic life is vitally dependent on certain major exports and a vast number of imports. The current difficulties in the realization of its ambitious industrialization program show that the country is extremely vulnerable to any interruption of the flow of foreign trade. Whenever it has been possible to collect facts on Cuban trade, it has become abundantly clear that the Communist world is unable to supply all of the basic essentials so desperately needed by Cuba. In pre-Castro days, the United States functioned as major supplier and purchaser of Cuban needs and exports. Now that the United States embargo on Cuban exports and imports is in operation and the Sino-Soviet world cannot supply Cuba's needs, many free world countries have stepped in to take a percentage of Cuban trade. The United States has asked its free world partners to assist in enforcing the embargo, but significant cooperation on the part of the free world countries has been disappointing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to include a list of these 66 countries that are currently trading with Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LISONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The countries referred to are as follows:

United States, Aden, Austria, Belgian-Luxembourg, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, Cambodia, Ceylon, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Malaya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, Vietnam, Argentina, Panama, Surinam, Uruguay, United Kingdom, Canada, Israel, Sudan, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Malta, Syria, Algeria, Chad, Guinea, Morocco, Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Brazil, British Guiana, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles, Nicaragua, Peru, Trinidad, Venezuela.

Mr. STINSON. Many of the nations of the world have also been providing the necessary ships and aircraft to carry on the trade and passenger transport so essential to the survival of communism in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include a list of shipping that has been going into Cuba, as provided by the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The list referred to is as follows:

LIST OF FREE WORLD AND POLISH FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN CUBA SINCE JANUARY 1, 1963

(Rept. No. 10)

SECTION 1. "Pursuant to the National Security Action Memorandum No. 220, dated February 5, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Administrator, Agency for International Development; and the Administrator, General Services Administration, concerning U.S. Government shipments by foreign-flag vessels in the Cuban trade, the Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate Departments the following list of vessels which have arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through June 14, 1963, exclusive of those vessels that called at Cuba on U.S. Government-approved noncommercial voyages and those listed in section 2:

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP

	Gross tonnage
Total, all flags (118 ships) --	961,368
British (37 ships) -----	355,354
Ardgem -----	6,981
Ardmore -----	4,664
Ardrowan -----	7,300
Arlington Court -----	9,662
Athelcrown (tanker) -----	11,149
Athelduke (tanker) -----	9,089
Athelmer (tanker) -----	7,524
Athelmonarch (tanker) -----	11,182
Athelsultan (tanker) -----	9,149
Avlsfalth -----	7,868
Chipbee -----	7,271
Flr Hill -----	7,119
Hazelmoor -----	7,907
Ho Fung -----	7,121
Ivy Fair -----	7,201
Linkmoor -----	8,236
London Confidence (tanker) -----	21,699
London Independence (tanker) -----	22,643
London Majesty (tanker) -----	12,132
London Pride (tanker) -----	10,776
London Splendour (tanker) -----	16,195
London Victory (tanker) -----	12,132
Lord Gladstone -----	11,299
Maratha Enterprise -----	7,166

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP—Con.	Gross tonnage
British—Continued	
Overseas Explorer (tanker) -----	16,267
Overseas Pioneer (tanker) -----	16,267
Pampas -----	7,589
Shlenfoen -----	7,127
Silverforce ¹ -----	8,058
Silverlake ¹ -----	8,058
Tulse Hill -----	7,120
Vercharmlan -----	7,265
Vergmont ¹ -----	7,381
West Breeze -----	8,718
Yungfutary -----	5,388
Yunglutaton ¹ -----	5,414
Zela M -----	7,237

Greek (30 ships) ----- 244,484

Aegalon ¹ -----	7,239
Aldebaran (tanker) -----	12,897
Americana -----	7,104
Apollon -----	9,744
Capetan Petros -----	7,291
Despolna -----	5,006
Efcharis ¹ -----	7,249
Eftychla ¹ -----	7,223
Embassy -----	8,418
Gallni -----	7,266
Gloria -----	7,128
Hydraios III -----	5,239
King Theseus -----	5,153
Kyra Harikla -----	6,888
Maria Santa -----	7,217
Mastro-Stellos II -----	7,282
North Empress -----	10,904
North Queen ¹ -----	9,341
Pamit -----	3,929
Pantanassa -----	7,131
Penelope -----	6,712
Perseus (tanker) -----	15,852
Pollux ¹ -----	9,956
Polyxen ¹ -----	7,143
Redestos -----	5,911
Selrios -----	7,239
Sirius (tanker) -----	16,241
Styllanos N. Vlassopoulos -----	7,244
Timios Stavros ¹ -----	5,269
Western Trader -----	9,268

Lebanese (19 ships) ----- 125,860

Akamas -----	7,285
Aloios II -----	7,256
Antonis ¹ -----	6,259
Astr ¹ -----	5,324
Carnation -----	4,884
Giorgos Tsakiroglou -----	7,240
Ilena -----	5,925
Kalliope D. Lemos ¹ -----	5,103
Malou -----	7,145
Mantric -----	7,255
Mousse -----	6,984
Noelle -----	7,251
Noemi -----	7,070
Oiga -----	7,199
Parmarina -----	6,721
Razanl -----	7,253
St. Anthony ¹ -----	5,349
St. Nicolas -----	7,165
Vassiliki ¹ -----	7,192

Italian (7 ships) ----- 53,415

Achille -----	6,950
Annalisa -----	2,479
Arenella -----	7,183
Cannaregio -----	7,184
Linda Giovanna (Tanker) -----	9,985
Nazareno -----	7,173
San Nicola (Tanker) -----	12,461

Polish (7 ships) ----- 44,734

Baltyk -----	6,963
Blalystok -----	7,173
Bytom -----	5,967
Chopin -----	6,987
Chorzow ¹ -----	7,237
Kopania Miechowice ¹ -----	7,223
Plast -----	3,184

Footnote at end of table.

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP—Con.	Gross tonnage
Norwegian (6 ships) -----	58,359
Benny Viking (now Benny) -----	3,857
Kongsgaard (Tanker) -----	19,999
Lovdal (Tanker) ¹ -----	12,764
Ole Bratt -----	5,252
Polyclipper (tanker) -----	11,737
Tine -----	4,750
Yugoslav (5 ships) -----	35,841
Bar -----	7,233
Cavtat -----	7,266
Cetinje ¹ -----	7,200
Dugi Otok -----	6,997
Trebinjica -----	7,145

Spanish (2 ships) ----- 4,565

Castillo Ampudia -----	3,566
Sierra Madre -----	999

Swedish (2 ships) ----- 14,295

Dagmar -----	6,490
Atlantic Friend ¹ -----	7,805

German (West) (1 ship: Adolf Leonhardt) -----	7,066
Japanese (1 ship): Meishun Maru -----	8,647
Moroccan (1 ship): Toubkal -----	8,748

¹ Added to Rept. No. 9 appearing in Federal Register issue of June 6, 1963.

SEC. 2. In accordance with the provisions of National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 of February 5, 1963, the following vessels which called at Cuba after January 1, 1963, have reacquired eligibility to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance that no ships under their control will, thenceforth, be employed in the Cuba trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade:

(a) Since last report: None.

(b) Previous reports:

Flag of registry	Number of ships
British -----	1
Danish -----	1

SEC. 3. The ships listed in sections 1 and 2 have made the following number of trips to Cuba in 1963, based on information received through June 14, 1963:

Flag of registry	Number of trips					
	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
British -----	5	8	8	17	13	2
Greek -----	4	6	8	8	11	2
Lebanese -----	1		2	8	6	2
Norwegian -----		2	4		1	1
Italian -----	1	1	1	2	3	1
Yugoslav -----		2	1	1	1	
Spanish -----			2			
Danish -----			1			
German (West) -----					1	
Japanese -----	1					
Moroccan -----			1			
Swedish -----				1		1
Total -----	12	19	28	37	36	9
Polish -----	2	1	1	2	2	1

NOTE.—Trip totals in this section exceed ship totals in secs. 1 and 2 because some of the ships made more than 1 trip to Cuba.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, both Spain and Mexico currently are flying their transport aircraft into Cuba. In addition, Communist Czechoslovakia also has its airlines scheduled into Cuba.

One of the most effective ways to stifle the Communist dictatorship in Cuba would be to eliminate trade by the na-

July 29

tions of the free world to which we are currently giving our foreign aid. If we were to ask nations in the free world to stop trade and shipping to Cuba, some of their reactions would be that as long as the United States is shipping material to Cuba that they will continue themselves. However, if the United States were to cease shipping all material to Cuba and demand that other nations do the same, I believe that very rapidly we would see a complete cessation of trade by the free world with Cuba. Now that the ransom deal has been completed with Cuba and they have some \$53 million of American medical supplies and foodstuffs, I can see no reason why we should continue to trade with them in any way.

There is a possibility that if we ask some of the free nations of the world to stop trading with Cuba that they might not do so. Therefore, I am going to propose an amendment to the foreign aid authorization act that would suspend all foreign aid for 1 year to any nation that continues to trade or ship with Cuba after 60 days after the passage of this bill. This suspension would be renewable if the nation continues trade or shipping to Cuba. It seems inconsistent to the welfare of the United States that we should help finance and support those nations who are trading and shipping to Cuba for profit. This is a peaceful, non-military, positive action that will be effective in curtailing communism in Cuba. I believe that this kind of positive leadership will be applauded by both nations of the Western Hemisphere and those nations throughout the world that believe that communism should be stopped. Today, almost all of the free world countries which are currently trading and shipping to Cuba are receiving some form of American foreign aid. The Iron Curtain countries would have an extremely difficult time in providing all of the various materials that are necessary to keep communism alive in Cuba. They would also be hard pressed to provide the necessary shipping to preserve the trade of Cuba. If the aircraft of those nations who are receiving American aid did not fly into Cuba, the flow of Communist agents to the free world would be greatly curtailed.

In addition, all nations currently permitting their ships and aircraft to travel to Cuba should be denied access to our harbors and airports.

These proposals are designed to prevent the American taxpayer's money from going to those nations who would knowingly help to preserve a Communist dictatorship just 90 miles from our shores.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] on his fine statement with regard to trade with Cuba and efforts to curtail it. I also congratulate the gentleman on his announcement of his intention to introduce an amendment to the foreign-aid bill which would help accomplish this.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman is familiar with the fact, and it has disturbed me, that a number of amendments were passed to the 1963 Foreign Aid Appropriation Act which have not been followed, which have been openly and notoriously violated.

I think it would be well at this point in the Record to place them in the Record. Public Law 87-872 provided very specifically that no foreign aid should go to any country that did business with Castro and Cuba. The act flatly banned U.S. aid to a country which permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba petroleum and certain other goods of a military or strategic character. That is an absolute ban.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure, and the gentleman knows, that tankers from a number of free nations have been carrying and are now carrying—and have been for the past 6 months—fuel to Cuba, including the United Kingdom, Greece, Italy, and Norway. However, the language of the law presents an absolute ban on this. It is incomprehensible that aid should continue to go to countries that send strategic materials to Cuba.

The second provision in the act prohibits economic aid to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed authoritatively that no such notification of such request has been made to any of the committees mentioned. My question is this: The administration is in direct violation of the mandate of the Congress of the United States as passed in Public Law 87-872. Myself and others have joined—I have just joined today in asking the General Accounting Office to inquire into what right the President has, if any, or the administration, to violate the mandate of the Congress which prohibits foreign aid funds from going to any country that does business with Cuba and to determine what actions can be taken regarding these illegal expenditures of funds.

Does not the gentleman feel that any administration, be it this or any other, which has a mandate from Congress with unequivocal language that the Chief Executive has the duty in spending funds to follow the mandate set out by Congress which, of course, is an expression of the will of the people of the United States of America? Is not the gentleman disturbed, as I am, that this or any other administration would continue to permit trade by free nations to whom we are giving foreign aid with Castro's Communist government in direct violation of the laws of the land?

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman for bringing up this point. I have to admit that I have a very difficult time

in understanding why the administration has not taken a more positive stand in this respect. I believe we should put this amendment into the foreign aid authorization bill but without an escape clause and underscore the law, you might say, that has already been enacted.

I further think we should bring this to the attention of the American people so that public opinion will be aroused to the point where they will demand that this foreign aid be stopped to these countries currently trading with Cuba.

I thank the gentleman very much for bringing this information at this time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am very conscious of the facts that the gentlemen have brought out on the floor of the House concerning limitations to foreign aid appropriations. They have done considerable work in reference to the United Nations technical programs and special fund aid that has gone in a round about way to Cuba. They have introduced a bill in this House to limit such appropriations to the 33 1/3 percent that prevails so far as the rest of the United Nations are concerned.

I would like to compliment the gentlemen on what they have brought forth today, then, to go back, in addition to the remarks about the situation of foreign aid the gentleman from Washington has so beautifully brought out, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and his remarks about the chagrin he feels about our lack of will and the deterioration of our backbone and the lack of our ideology in preventing these things, including the sanctity of the Monroe Doctrine and many others. The review that this group has brought to the floor today under the special order concerning everything from the overflights to the McCone report of the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, to the United Nations funds and the seizure of our Embassy by Cuba's Castro and the conspiracy in spite of all that the Swiss can do about it has been enlightening. We pay tribute in spite of the old American adage we would rise in our defense but not one cent for tribute. We are the Nation that sent the Marines to Tripoli under a far less excuse than the seizure of our Embassy in Havana, which is American property.

What has happened to the will, what has happened to our determination? Wherein lies the fault of the people that we as Representatives in Congress and others do not seem to realize. We should cut off, as someone very clearly suggested, not only the food of Cuba but the black gold that is flowing to Cuba in the form of oil.

We made a good start on this and we should see, by all means, as the gentleman has beautifully said, that the Red Star in Cuba is in its descendancy and let us be careful to see that it loses brightness in going over the horizon.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman. Many people think that the moral

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12827

fiber of the American people has deteriorated to the point where they will not fight anymore. I happen to disagree with this philosophy. I believe the American people are willing to fight to remain free and have their children live in freedom. I think if the decision were to be made by the American people, we would very rapidly see a very tough policy advocated toward the Communists in Cuba.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I want to thank all of you gentlemen who are making possible this special order today. It is high time that the two sides of the aisle of this House join together in forcing the administration into legitimate action and seeing to it that they do not go forward in illegitimate acts. Does any of you have information relative to the imprisonment of Cuban women? I was waited upon the other day by a woman who was a Cuban—she is now an American, of course—and a Cuban. They had a good deal to say about the women who are imprisoned in Cuba and who are being treated just awful. The only other country that could compare with the treatment was Turkey. I had a friend in a Turkish prison for 3 years, and the situation there was one that could not be imagined. The only one I have ever heard since then that could be compared with the Turkish situation is what is being done to these women. I hope this group will look into the matter and see what can be done to accelerate some sort of freedom and for some kind of decent treatment for those women down there.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] for his fine remarks.

Now I yield to my colleague from Florida, that very able and distinguished gentleman [Mr. FUQUA] who has been most active in this fight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 13 minutes remaining.

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida and my other colleagues who joined with us today in this bipartisan effort to bring to light some of the ways in which we might rid ourselves of Communism not only in Cuba but in the rest of this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, we come here today not as Democrats or Republicans, but we come here as Americans. It is in this light I think that we should attack this problem which threatens the very foundation on which this country was founded. President Kennedy said during the October crisis in Cuba that the greatest risk lies in not acting with decisiveness. Action is required. This I think is the time for this country to take decisive action in trying to rid Cuba and this hemisphere of godless Communism.

It has been said here earlier today that Cuba's normal economic life depends on certain major exports and imports coming into that country from other parts of the world. We have seen, since the Communist takeover in Cuba, the Soviet Union and other of their Communist bloc countries that have tried to overcome this disruption by attempting to supply the essential foods and other essential goods that once came from the United States, which was one of the greatest importers into Cuba. Currently we have about 13 Communist countries who are participating in about 75 to 80 percent of the total Cuban export and import trade. Wherever we find the facts of the Cuban trade it is very clear that the Communist world is unable to supply them and the cost is too high to supply the basic essentials which are so desperately needed by the people of Cuba. Since the United States placed an embargo on Cuban exports and imports, the operations of the Sino-Soviet world cannot supply many of the vital needs to the people of Cuba.

The United States has time and time again through our State Department and other means asked our allies and our partners of the free world to stop trading with this Communist country. We tried to enforce through all types of moral persuasion, ways in which we can stop this trading with our known enemy, one that has had missiles pointed at us in the October crisis and which has caused the greatest amount of subversion in this hemisphere emanating from that island. However, it has been said this met with very disappointing success and that they continued to trade with them.

I would like to cite you some figures of countries who are our allies in the free world and cite the amount of trade they are doing with Cuba and the foreign aid that these countries are getting from this very country, the United States.

We are feeding the hand that is feeding our enemies.

Great Britain in the year 1962 received \$27.5 million in foreign aid. In the time between January 1, 1963, and June 14, 1963, Great Britain had 37 ships carrying 355,354 gross tons into Cuba.

Greece, one of our other allies, received \$82.8 million in foreign aid. In this same period of time, less than 6 months, they had 30 ships carrying 244,484 gross tons.

Lebanon, receiving \$.1 million in aid had 19 ships going into Cuba with 125,860 tons.

Italy, receiving \$105.3 million in foreign aid had seven ships carrying 53,415 tons into Cuba.

Poland—there is a question whether they are an ally or not, but they are receiving \$8.1 million in foreign aid. In this same period they had 7 ships going into Cuba carrying 44,734 tons.

Norway received \$24.9 million in aid. They had 6 ships going in carrying 58,359 gross tons.

Yugoslavia had \$116.7 million in aid. They had 5 ships carrying 35,841 tons.

Spain: \$67.5 million in aid. They had 2 ships carrying 4,565 gross tons.

West Germany received \$2.2 million

in aid. They had one ship carrying 7,066 tons.

Japan received \$141.8 million in aid and they had one ship carrying 8,657 tons.

Morocco received \$49.8 million in aid. They had one ship carrying 8,748 tons.

These are our friends. Hence the obvious question has arisen as to why the United States continues to give aid to those countries who find themselves unable to acquiesce in the U.S. request for cooperation in the economic embargo against Cuba.

The large foreign aid this country has been giving other countries, many of them still trading with Cuba, has resulted in our current problem with balance of payments. It was necessary for this country to borrow \$500 million from the International Monetary Fund to assist us through this crisis.

With all this in mind, how can we justify this aid to these countries who in turn aid our enemy?

The time has now come that the Congress should take positive action by amending the Foreign Aid Authorization Act to prohibit aid to these countries who continue to trade with Communist Cuba, with our avowed enemy. I hope that the Congress will act, and I will support the amendment to the authorization act when it comes to the floor affecting these countries that are receiving this aid.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, that bill passed and what the gentleman is suggesting was supposed to be done. The administration has been told that they must stop giving aid to those countries who are going against us in that particular manner. What can we do further to insist that the administration obey the law?

Mr. FUQUA. I think we should pass another amendment this time and make it very clear that they may not trade with these other countries. Perhaps we should make it clearer than the amendment that we had to the Foreign Aid Authorization Act of last year.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my able colleague from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] for those very fine and constructive remarks. He so ably pointed out that this is not a question of whether America must fight to do something about Cuba. As he so ably pointed out, there are many things short of fighting that we could do to turn this cold war in our favor. I would urge my colleagues not to be trapped by the old argument that in order to do something constructive we must fight or we must invade Cuba. That is not the question.

The question is what other peaceful and ideological means we can use to gain freedom for the Cubans and for the rest of the people in Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the very able and distin-

guished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Members here today for their continued interest and concern in the problem of Cuba. Let me take a moment or two to attempt to place the question of Cuba in the context of the world situation. I think there is a danger that the discussion today could leave the impression that some had a fixation on Cuba, as has been charged against those of us who have studied and concerned ourselves with this problem. I believe that the question of Cuba is much more important than simply Cuba. It represents, I believe, one specific instance of the serious problem which this Nation has as a leader of the free world. I would suggest that how we conduct ourselves with respect to Cuba could do much to determine the fate of the remainder of this hemisphere and indeed much of the world.

More than a century and a quarter ago the French scholar, Alexis DeTocqueville, visited our country and made the following prophetic observation. He said:

There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations, and the world learned of their existence and their greatness at almost the same time. . . . The American struggles against the obstacles which nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russians are men. The farmer combats the wilderness and savage life, the latter civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the Americans are therefore gained by the plowshare. Those of the Russians by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided strength and commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; and of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same. Each of them seems marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

These were DeTocqueville's observations in 1832.

Just 20 years ago the Communist world included 8 million square miles of territory and 70 million people. Today it includes 16 million square miles of territory and the number of human beings behind the Iron Curtain is 970 million. Within four decades communism has grown from a gleam in Lenin's eye to absolute domination of almost 1 billion people. Historians will certainly ask the questions why and how. I believe the principal reason for these enormous gains has been the Communists' ability to conceive of this struggle for power going on in the world today in larger dimensions than the free world.

Through infiltration and control of student groups, teachers unions, labor organizations, schools, and political parties, the Communists are able today to achieve their goals by playing this multi-

headed network like an orchestra, varying the mode of approach—military, paramilitary, political, psychological, technological, and economic—to suit the problem, the time, and the place. Their weapons are of unlimited variety. In short, they score victories in the cold war because they know they are in it and they have polished the weapons necessary for victory.

Inexorably, bit by bit, more pieces of the free world have been lost. Whenever the West has won a round, as in Korea or Lebanon, it was in the defense of the status quo. When the Communists have won a round, as in Czechoslovakia, China, Laos, or Cuba, they have gained access to ground previously closed to them.

The greatest need and the greatest hope for the United States and the free world today lies in the establishment and maintenance of some stability in the world, particularly in Latin America. Today, however, words will no longer achieve this stability. Much of the world unfortunately believes, and with much justification, that the Communists very possibly could ultimately win. Until the United States changes this attitude, this atmosphere, the pendulum will not swing our way.

Today many smaller nations watch and wait. Some are swinging to communism. To change this attitude, the United States must demonstrate a clear desire and willingness to preserve freedom. I believe sincerely that our posture with respect to Cuba will determine the fate of all Latin America. We need deeds to convince the wavering nations of our resolution and that ultimately freedom will prevail.

In a report from Freedom House, it was stated that:

Americans are agreed that a Soviet Cuba is intolerable to the Western Hemisphere.

The reasons bear upon our security and freedom as well as the independence and integrity of the other nations in this hemisphere.

The facts about Castro and Communist Cuba are beyond debate. Six million people who won their freedom from Batista's dictatorship found themselves betrayed into the hands of a new dictatorship. They are denied the right to vote, to speak, to publish, to think. More than 100,000 Cubans have been jailed for refusing to accept communism. Another 250,000 have fled, preferring exile to tyranny at home; 180,000 more are awaiting transportation and countless others dream of escaping terror.

Cuba has become an overt Soviet Satellite—the only one in the Americas. The Castro regime deliberately banded over the island to the Russian dictator and allowed it to be transferred into a launching pad for potential aggression against the United States and the other countries of this hemisphere.

Present conditions do not suggest that the evil has been abated much less eliminated. Even if we could be certain that every offensive military weapon has been removed from Cuba we would still live in the presence of the 20th century's most efficient offensive weapon—communism itself. This time bomb is still to be defused.

American policy must rest on three objectives:

1. The elimination of the Soviet political and military bases in Cuba;

2. The halting of Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin-American peoples; and

3. The liberation of the Cuban nation from Castro's brutal police state. Americans will unite behind any program that gives hope of achieving these goals.

There are many steps which can be taken and should be taken and have not been taken to achieve our common goals in the cold war. Many have been mentioned today, and I will not belabor them. They are sound and constructive, but I would suggest that the first step that must be taken, the step without which all the others will be meaningless, is for this Nation, the people of this country, and the administration, to admit that we are in the cold war and to demand policies that will meet the threat that we face. Unless we as a nation, the Congress, the administration and the people, take this step, all of these other suggestions, as constructive, positive and sound and worthwhile as they might be, can amount to nothing.

I would congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua], on his point that the suggestion, as some claim, that any step to stop the tide of Communist aggression on this globe and to rid this hemisphere of communism will result in a nuclear holocaust or war, is not supported by the facts. Each time this Nation has stiffened its backbone, as in October 1962, we have avoided war and received the overwhelming support of the free world.

As the President has said, and as history shows, the greatest risk of all may very well be the failure to act, when action is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today to discuss this question and to voice my concern, indeed, alarm, with the drift of American foreign policy. I congratulate them on their thoughtful and responsible approach to this difficult and complex problem. I know that each of the Members here today have been working for months, indeed years, on the problems of the cold war.

I would like to call particular attention by way of example to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh] who has labored long, hard, and effectively to improve national knowledge of the cold war and is certainly recognized nationally as an expert in this field. I consider it a high privilege to serve in the Congress with him.

Let us hope and indeed pray, in closing, that when this body convenes next month or next year, that Brazil or Haiti or one or more of the other nations of Latin America will not have fallen to the Communists, whether by bluff or by war.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very fine and constructive remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver].

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Florida and the Members who have spoken up to now. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in this discussion and to commend the gentlemen who have arranged today's discussion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. Speaker, I think that the discussion we have witnessed today, and are witnessing now, can indeed make a tremendous contribution toward a better understanding of the vast problem that lies ahead in the ultimate liberation of Cuba from Communist rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate these gentlemen for the bipartisan effort that they have demonstrated here today. I do not think they have tried to dig into past closets looking for skeletons, because indeed the road is full of these skeletons. But, rather, they have tried to discuss a positive program of action. I think this is the way that Cuba is ultimately going to be liberated.

Mr. Speaker, I for instance do not agree with statements made here earlier that we are having an aimless drift of American foreign policy. On the contrary, I think this administration and the previous administrations have tried to meet this problem. They realized that this is a problem of international significance and certainly what we do in Cuba—if we could isolate our problem in Cuba just to Cuba, there would be no question that two good battalions of Marines could flush out Castro and his communist hordes and the ball game would be over—has worldwide repercussions.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can certainly question the fact that we could if we wanted to follow that path we could get rid of Castro very quickly. However as has been stated repeatedly by learned scholars on the international scene, what happens in Cuba has ramifications all over the world. For this reason I think the suggestions made here today are certainly ones worthy of serious consideration by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], has introduced H.R. 7687, which provides, as follows:

That no article shall be transported in interstate or foreign commerce to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows vessels sailing under the flag of that country to be used, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, in trade or commerce with Cuba [except U.S. installations in Cuba].

Certainly this is a very sweeping proposal, but one which I think would put teeth into the concern shown here today by the speakers in the well of the House who have tried to understand why, despite the great pleas by the United States, many of our finest friends and allies continue to deal with Communist Cuba. Certainly the bill which has been introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is one that should be considered by the Congress and I shall be happy to cosponsor this resolution.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] has suggested that we close off the Panama Canal to ships that are going to Cuba. I certainly think that this is a worthwhile suggestion which should be considered very seriously by the responsible authorities.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] has suggested that we might amend the Foreign Aid Act to bar any foreign aid to countries which continue to deal with Cuba. This is an excellent idea, and I am sure one that is going to get great consideration from the Congress, although I think that a close examination will show that there are relatively few countries now receiving foreign aid, if any, that are actually shipping into Cuba. But, nevertheless, this is a subject which I think should be considered favorably by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I, myself, 3 years ago, helped organize a Cuban Freedom Committee which today is broadcasting, and has been for several years, standard wave band broadcasts to Cuba. I see on the floor of the House this afternoon the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], who is a director of this committee. I think our committee has been doing a great job in bringing the truth about communism and particularly the failure of communism to the people in Cuba, day in and day out. We receive reports out of Cuba that these standard wave band broadcasts are being listened to with great interest. We have purchased time from commercial stations in Florida at Key West. These broadcasts are being beamed in the Spanish language to the people in Cuba and, certainly, in my judgment they are having a profound effect. The fact that Mr. Castro is finding tremendous difficulties all over the island attests to that. There is widespread sabotage throughout Cuba. There is tremendous resentment among the Cuban people against Castro and this resentment is growing. So in my opinion we can look forward to the day when Cuba will be liberated from within.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think all of these things that have been discussed here today, in a bipartisan vein, will serve a definite purpose. It is my opinion that this is the road to liberating Cuba from communism.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that when we have discussions such as we are having here today and we can dispassionately discuss the problem which we have at hand and the various solutions that are available to us, we will indeed be able to find a way to liberate these people and again bring Cuba back into the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time it is my intention to introduce a resolution in Congress for the establishment of a Presidential Joint Commission for the Liberation of Cuba.

This commission would have as its membership representatives of the State Department, representatives of the CIA, representatives of the Defense Department, and representatives of the appropriate committees of Congress. I think that all the things we have been discussing here today should be considered by a

committee like this. The establishment of such a committee, in my judgment, would meet the test that has been mentioned here—of strengthening our will to win. It would certainly serve notice on the rest of the world that we are determined that the Communist menace must be removed from the Western Hemisphere, certainly from Cuba.

It is my hope at the time when this resolution is introduced it will receive consideration by the Congress.

There is no lack of will, either by this administration or the previous administration or by the Congress of the United States, to get the Communists out of Cuba. All Americans, whether they are in office or out of office, whether they belong to the Republican Party or Democratic Party, whether they serve in the State Department or in the CIA or in the executive branch of the Government or legislative branch of the Government, are agreed there must be a return of freedom to Cuba. We are all agreed that communism must be driven out of Cuba. Where there is disagreement is in the method of getting this accomplished, and as we listen to the debates of the Organization of American States and as we listen to the ramifications of the United Nations, we realize no unilateral action is going to do this job. In order to rid Cuba and the Western Hemisphere of Communists, we must have a bilateral unified action of all the American States in this hemisphere and, if we can, the free nations of the United Nations.

We have a tremendous problem. In my judgment, the establishment of a Presidential joint commission that would reflect the many views expressed here today, the suggestions that have been made here today, would give meaning to our ultimate purpose. That purpose is the liberation of Cuba in a peaceful way.

I recently asked the people of my district for their views on the various alternatives to the solution of this problem of ridding Cuba of Communism. There were three sets of questions submitted for the consideration of my constituents.

The first question was: Do you favor our continued surveillance over Cuba to make sure there are no offensive weapons down there? The answer was, of course, "Yes."

The second question was: Do you favor continuing economic pressures to bring about the economic collapse of Cuba? Here the answer was overwhelmingly "Yes."

Finally I asked: Do you favor our continuing efforts to inspire a revolt in Cuba? The answer was "Yes."

The next question: Do you favor a total naval blockade of Cuba at this time? The answer was "No."

The second part of the question was: Do you believe such a total naval blockade is an act of aggression? The answer was "Yes."

The next question was: Do you think such an act of aggression would lead to war? The answer was indecisive. Some thought yes and some thought no.

Finally, the last question I asked was: Do you favor an immediate invasion of

July 29

Cuba? Here the answer was overwhelmingly "No."

The second part of that question was: Do you believe an invasion of Cuba at this time would lead to nuclear war? Here the answer was overwhelmingly "Yes."

These answers from a representative group of people in one district of the United States indicate the American people agree on most of the solutions that have been discussed here today, economic pressures, an amendment in foreign aid, closing of the Panama Canal, and adopting a resolution such as the one offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. The response to these questions shows that the American people have a profound and sound judgment on these matters and agree with most Members of this Congress who reject the concept that the solution to the Cuban problem is invasion, a unilateral invasion of Cuba at this time.

I agree with the sponsors of this discussion today. I think the discussions such as we have had today, with the exchange of ideas that have been presented, will result in an effective, workable formula for liberating Cuba of its Communist rulers and bring Cuba back into the family of other nations again.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate the sponsors, and I am privileged to have been invited to participate in this discussion.

Thank you very much.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much for his fine statement.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his fine statement on all the subjects he covered. He did mention, however, that he had some doubts that there were very many of the free world countries who were actually trading with Cuba and receiving foreign aid. I have to agree with the gentleman that it is hard for any Member of Congress to believe the list of countries of the free world trading with Cuba is as long as it is. I would like to ask you to refer to the record in which I have included a list of the free world countries who are trading with Communist Cuba. It includes 66 countries.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Are they presently receiving foreign aid?

Mr. STINSON. Fifty-four of the 66 countries trading with Cuba are receiving some form of foreign aid from the United States. It is an incredible thing, I quite agree, and it is very difficult for us to comprehend here in Congress.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should be very happy to join the gentleman in supporting his amendment. If it is indeed a fact that we are giving foreign aid to countries that in turn deal with Communist Cuba, I should be very happy to join the gentleman in offering an amendment to bar supporting them with foreign aid.

Mr. STINSON. I wish to thank the gentleman for his support and congratulate him once again.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Personally I thank the gentleman and also the Members of Congress who have participated in this discussion here today. I think it is a healthy thing and something we should do. However, I want to call the attention of the Members to the fact that Cuba of course is not just a new situation but it has been with us for a long time. It has been a rather remarkable thing to me that the Cuban situation has been allowed to continue when in a way the answer is simple. There is at least one measure this Nation could have taken and still can take I think to get rid of Castro Cuba. As the gentleman well knows it has been suggested that the American Government sponsor a government in exile. I think that is the first step we should take in this Nation to cure this situation. I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that just off of Cuba is the Isle of Pines where I understand, and I have very reliable information in this, that there are over 100,000 political prisoners, that is, on the Isle of Pines. Many of these prisoners over there are trained military men. They have nothing to lose because they are now incarcerated there and are doing slave work, with no hope until Castro is destroyed. Why this country does not go in there and supply this 100,000, or whatever number of military or ex-military men are on that island, and supply them with enough military material really to start a revolution and take over this island and allow this Government to recognize a government in exile there and have a foot in the door, is something I cannot understand. That is so plain to me that the stupidity of our own people who have a responsibility here to protect the security of our United States, in the administration, is something I do not understand and the governments of South and Latin America must be confused because of our lack of action. Why they have not done it I do not know. It seems to me that would be a firm step and would be a step which would bring about the downfall of the Castro regime in Cuba and we could get rid of that cancerous growth.

All of this talk will never get us anywhere until somebody in the administration, somebody important in the military affairs of this country, takes the necessary steps to get the necessary force to go in there and remove this cancer.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and I shall decline to yield any further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. WEAVER. I shall decline to yield any further until this next speaker has concluded. There will be another special order on the same subject which will follow and there will be plenty of time in that period.

I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time, Mr. Speaker, that all Members speaking here today may be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and others who have arranged this special order today in order to focus the spotlight of attention on this problem that we face in Cuba.

International communism's foothold in the Caribbean, Castro's Cuba, continues to be a sore spot in our foreign policy. The menace promises to persist, too, unless and until the United States assumes a more decisive role in its removal.

So far, the major effort of the administration seems to be counting the movement of Soviet men and equipment going to and coming from the island. There is little evidence of last October's determination in dealing with this threat to our security.

Any advance communism makes should trouble us. This is why we are participating in the defense of South Vietnam and why our troops are stationed around the world in potentially explosive areas. Yet, we are reluctant to exercise a similar concern over an area in our own backyard.

Every American knows that Cuba is a Russian-dominated country; that the Red Army is within 90 miles of our coast; and that our own administration is failing to take any action. We cannot feel secure in our own homes, our own localities, or our own country until something is done to correct the situation.

If we are to remove communism from Cuba there must be a positive restatement of the Monroe Doctrine. Based on the principle that a foreign government shall not colonize in the Western Hemisphere, this doctrine is fully applicable today.

Every day's delay in enunciating a firm U.S. policy toward elimination of the Communist grip on Cuba and taking the steps necessary for its implementation only serves to convince the Communists that we are capable of waging only a "war of words." Khrushchev and Castro must be told emphatically and clearly that we mean business.

There is no alternative to action. Whatever must be done to rid Cuba of communism must be done.

The risks of an all-out conflict rise in proportion to our hesitancy. Instead of quarantining the Cuban exiles we should quarantine Cuba; rather than protecting the shores of Cuba we should be giving support to the exiles who are trying to increase the pressure on Castro. Instead of slapping the exile in the face we ought to be patting him on the back and giving him our encouragement to free Cuba.

America always has worn proudly the mantle of leadership. It is expected

from our allies. Still, recent events have shown the administration's lack of willingness to act forthrightly in this area.

How can we in the United States proclaim that we will risk our cities in defense of these in Europe when less than a hundred miles from our own shores there is a Communist regime maintained and supported by the whole Communist bloc?

Many proposals have been advanced by responsible leaders of the free world which would embark us on the kind of course needed to free Cuba. I petition the administration to listen to these views.

The focus of this Nation should be on complete and total isolation of Cuba. Its very insular nature makes it almost totally dependent on outside commerce. This fact can be exploited. Through established legal means the United States can limit Cuban commerce and bring Castro to his knees.

Psychological warfare is another means which the United States can employ to counter Castro. Reports continue to come from Cuba of popular discontent with the Communist rulers. We need to step up our efforts to nurture that feeling through Voice of America broadcasts and through pledging support of the Cuban people's desire for freedom.

Positive results demand positive action. The time for assessing the situation is long since over. Before it is too late, before those who look to the United States as the defender of right and justice turn away disappointed and disenchanted, and before communism so mercilessly stifles the voice of liberation inside Cuba, let us put Khrushchev on notice that unless there is a summary withdrawal of the Soviet warming machine from Cuba, this Nation will see to its accomplishment.

Once devoid of his Soviet support, Castro will fall of his own weight.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from New York has been speaking of the economic pressures which might be applied against Cuba and has emphasized that these economic pressures could be very effective in bringing about the downfall of Castro's government. There are those who say it cannot be done. But in a similar situation, Nasser has been denying the use of the Suez Canal to the Israelis for many, many years. We, as a matter of fact, tried to put greater pressure on Nasser to bar him from doing this. Certainly if he can do it I think we can certainly apply some economic pressures to relieve the Cuban situation. Will the gentleman agree?

Mr. HORTON. I believe the gentleman has made a good point. Certainly this has not brought about a nuclear war in the Middle East, but all sorts of pressures have been brought by the free world to free up the Suez Canal. I think this is a good point the gentleman has made, especially when he talks about blocking commerce to Cuba. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me as my other colleagues have agreed that it is

very important for this country to do all it can to isolate Cuba and prevent commerce from going into the island.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his yielding, and congratulate all those who have helped put the spotlight on this very important problem which is taking place just a few miles from our shores.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to talk about the Punta del Este Resolution 2 and other agreements and treaties.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PUNTA DEL ESTE RESOLUTION 2

The problem of what to do about communism in the Western Hemisphere is ever present with Castro in Cuba. The Monroe Doctrine has been discussed as a legal weapon wherewith we should proceed to act in aid of the restoration of Cuba to democracy. However, it is well for us to note that certain multilateral treaties have established a firm foundation for the collective action of the nations of this hemisphere.

A. RIO TREATY OF 1947

At Rio de Janeiro, September 2, 1947, the nations of the Western Hemisphere gathered together and signed an Inter-American treaty for reciprocal assistance between the United States of America and the other American Republics. Article VIII of this treaty states:

For the purposes of this treaty the measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed forces.

ARTICLE 6

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory of the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression of, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent.

You might summarize the Rio Treaty as providing for collective self-defense for all nations of the Western Hemisphere.

B. CARACAS DECLARATION OF 1964

The 10th Inter-American Conference of March 28, 1954, at Caracas, Venezuela, put forth a declaration of solidarity against international Communist intervention:

The Fourth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs recognized that, in addition to adequate internal measures in each state, a high degree of international cooperation is required to eradicate the danger which the subversive activities of international communism pose for the American States.

The aggressive character of the international Communist movement continues to

constitute, in the context of world affairs, a special and immediate threat to the national institutions and the peace and security of the American States, and to the right of each state to develop its cultural, political, and economic life freely and naturally without intervention in its internal or external affairs by other states.

According to the declaration:

The domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties.

The declaration says further:

That, without prejudice to such other measures as they may consider desirable, special attention be given by each of the American governments to the following steps for the purpose of counteracting the subversive activities of the international Communist movement within their respective jurisdictions:

1. Measures to require disclosure of the identity, activities, and sources of funds of those who are spreading propaganda of the international Communist movement or who travel in the interests of that movement, and of those who act as its agents or in its behalf; and

2. The exchange of information among governments to assist in fulfilling the purpose of the resolutions adopted by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs regarding international communism.

Thus to supplement the Rio Treaty for collective self-defense, the Caracas Declaration recognized the aggressive character of international communism and is a pledge of solidarity against Communist intervention.

C. ACT OF BOGOTÁ, 1960

Since President Eisenhower's statement of July 11, 1960, foreshadowing the Act of Bogotá of the Alliance for Progress, the United States has moved to disassociate itself from the extreme conservatives at the top of the Latin American oligarchy. With this the confidence of the other democracies of the Western Hemisphere was gained.

D. RESOLUTION 2 OF PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE, JANUARY 1962

The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs was held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, January 22-31, 1962. Here a final act was adopted which provided specifically another step toward the idea of collective self-defense which was originally set forth in the Rio Treaty. Punta del Este recognized fully the meaning and the threat to the Americas of international communism. Resolution 2 spelled out what actions could be taken by member states. I quote this resolution agreed to at the Conference and endorsed by the administration.

The Council of the Organization of American States, meeting as the provisional organ of consultation, resolves:

To urge the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to coun-

teract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

To recommend that the member states in accordance with articles 8 and 9 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, take all measures, individually and collectively including the use of Armed Force, which they may deem necessary to insure that the Government of Cuba cannot continue to receive from the Sino-Soviet powers military material and related supplies which may threaten the peace and security of the continent and to prevent the missiles in Cuba with offensive capability from ever becoming an active threat to the peace and security of the Continent.

Latin Americans who first tended to view the Castro Cuban situation as primarily a bilateral problem of the United States and Cuba now consider this a multilateral problem for the whole hemisphere. Thus the implementation of multilateral action through the Punta del Este Resolution 2 and the Monroe Doctrine could add to the strength and forcefulness of a new United States position in the eyes of Latin America.

By cooperative leadership we can work with other hemispheric countries along the two parallel lines of peaceful democratic and political resolution. These measures of economic development and social reform are envisioned by the Alliance for Progress. Political and, if need be, paramilitary, antiguerrilla measures also can be taken to protect this revolution from the scavengers of Havana.

For too long the United States has not been able to carry the message to the Latin American nations that this country believes in the principles of non-intervention and self-determination. This means Americans recognize the right of peoples to organize their way of life freely in political, economic, and cultural spheres and to express their will through free elections without foreign interference.

By uniting together we can then mutually urge, as member states, to take those steps that are considered appropriate for individual or collective self-defense and to cooperate to strengthen the capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion or other dangers to the peace and security. These factors arise from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers. This cooperation must be in accordance with the obligations established in treaties, agreements such as the Charter of the OAS—Organization of American States—and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. The organization of a Latin American Treaty Organization could function similarly to NATO. Thus a LATO could be the mutual task force of action when it is deemed necessary.

There are those who would say that the Cubans asked for the Sino-Soviets to come to their island to protect them from invasion. But at this point in our history Cuba stands not only as a Communist satellite, but completely depend-

ent upon the graces of the Sino-Soviet alliance, shaky as it may be. Continued occupation of this island implies nothing more than Russian imperialism imposed upon the Western Hemisphere. The collective action of the United States with its allied Western Hemisphere nations, putting into effect the Punta del Este Resolution 2, can then work together to overthrow the Castro regime through peaceful efforts.

There is no question about the intervention of the Soviets in Cuba. There is no question that the United States wishes to give the Cubans an opportunity to express their self-determination and national sovereignty free of this foreign yoke.

We who stand here today on the floor of Congress speak out in many individual ways, but with a collective tone. We Members of Congress want Cuba free from Soviet interference. We want the Cubans to have the basic inherent rights of choosing their own future through democratic processes.

CUBA AND THE COLD WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLOY].

Mr. McCLOY. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to join my other colleagues in the House to discuss the problem created by Castro's Communist Cuba. I think what all of us are searching for in calling attention of the administration to the need for action, is that we find there is no discernible program of action, providing hope for a solution of the Communist problem in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the catastrophe at the Bay of Pigs. Up to that time we were led to believe that we would provide support for Cubans in exile who undertook the military invasion of their homeland. Yet, at the crucial moment, we found that such a program did not exist or was changed and the support was withdrawn.

Again, when the official announcement was made of the presence of nuclear missiles on the island of Cuba, we were convinced that a positive program existed, first, to rid the island of Cuba of these nuclear missiles; and, second, to assure the people of this country and of the free world that physical inspection of the island would assure us that the missiles were removed. But, the physical inspection of the missile bases on the island of Cuba never took place. Instead—and I do not suggest that this was part of any agreement or understanding—we discontinued our missile bases that we had maintained up to that time in Turkey and in Italy.

Mr. Speaker, we know that certain steps have been taken with regard to Cuban shipping. But we know too that shipping is taking place through the ships of free nations who are entering Cuban ports and supplying Castro and the Communists with much-needed civilian goods—as well as other goods for all we know.

Mr. Speaker, we thought that if the exiles organized and launched attacks on or against Cuban shipping that these would be supported. But instead this was frowned upon and action taken to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, we were distressed when we found that the U.N. through the financial facilities at its disposal, was providing economic aid for an agricultural experiment project in Cuba, with very little done on our part to prevent it.

During all these episodes and these events we have been dismayed that there appears no positive and aggressive program to rid the island of Cuba of Castro's communism.

So we are searching here today for something beyond passive attitudes, and we are seeking more satisfactory answers as far as our American constituency is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we must adhere to the proven efficacy of the Monroe Doctrine. We know without its enforcement, without limiting the Western Hemisphere to free countries and preventing the encroachment of hostile foreign nations that our entire national safety and security are jeopardized.

So in the interest of our national security and our national safety, and to encourage the development of a program behind which we can all lend our support and which will have the wholehearted support of the American people, we speak out and speak forth. United, from both sides of the aisle, we urge and implore that such a program be developed and that appropriate and necessary action to carry it out shall take place.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Illinois has, of course, reviewed the past. I have previously congratulated the sponsors of this program for arranging today's discussion to see whether or not we may look forward to discussing concrete plans that might throw some light and hope on the day when Cuba will be liberated from its Communist rulers. So long as my distinguished and pleasant colleague from Illinois, just north of me, wants to go back into the closets, I suggest that we do not stop with the Bay of Pigs invasion, serious as it may have been. Perhaps you should go back a little further. The gentleman very conveniently ignores the fact that Mr. Castro came to power on New Year's Day, 1959, when the previous administration was in power, the previous administration that had brought Mr. Castro to the city of Washington. We all remember the very fine reception given that young man in this city. He was wine and dined and we heard speeches in the Statler Hotel. Certainly Mr. Castro was brought here by an administration other than this one.

The present administration, when the time came, when it became apparent that Mr. Castro constituted a clear and overt threat to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, when we uncovered the missile launching platforms in Cuba, this administration,

as President Kennedy so magnificently stated last Friday, did not hesitate to serve notice on the Soviet Union and Mr. Castro that if those offensive weapons were not removed forthwith we would shower the island of Cuba with full retaliation. Nobody can find any wishy-washy attitude of the President, Mr. Kennedy, when he was in command of the situation in October of 1962.

We have heard a great deal about the Bay of Pigs invasion, clearly ignoring the fact the Bay of Pigs was organized by the previous administration under the then Director of the CIA appointed by a previous administration. Our young President came into office in January 1961 and 2 months later he was faced with the decision of starting war over Cuba. His caution is understandable. But after he had established himself, when he had full control of the situation, Mr. Kennedy did not hesitate in October 1962, to say we are ready to stand up in the defense of freedom, even at the cost of a nuclear holocaust. He certainly spoke candidly to Mr. Castro and Mr. Khrushchev and the Communists and they had to retreat.

So, as long as we are going to have a record, let us have a complete record. It is my hope there will be more of these special orders on a bipartisan basis and with a bipartisan approach, where we are going to be able to discuss, as we have discussed today, concrete forward-moving proposals that are not going to lament the past but, rather, give us all hope that the future can bring an assurance that communism will be eradicated from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the bipartisan approach to this subject. I assume that the reason we have Members from both sides of the aisle speaking up today is because we want to give support to a bipartisan program. I do not want to suggest that there were no errors committed before the Bay of Pigs. Nevertheless, I think there is a general dissatisfaction with respect to that and the other events affecting our Cuban policy which I enumerated. There is a desire today for something more positive; a program directed toward Castro's Cuba to which Republicans and Democrats alike can turn to find an answer and can support. I know that is what the American people want. In reviewing some of these blunders and these incidents it is quite clear that the administration's action did not reflect such a policy. Recognizing the need for a forward looking program and a positive program, I think it is necessary to review to some extent events that have occurred during the time this administration has been in office. I support the Members on both sides of the aisle who are today looking for an answer and who, I assume, are commending to the executive and administration, which has charge of our foreign affairs, a positive and identifiable program behind which we can rally. Quite obviously that program does not exist or

else we would not be speaking up as we are here today. It is the lack of that program and the need for it which we feel. It is such a program which we want to encourage, and which we are confident can benefit the entire free world.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. I too am delighted to see this discussion with regard to the problem which Cuba presents, particularly as it relates to subversion in the hemisphere. The findings of all the committees that have looked into it, the Selden subcommittee, the Stennis subcommittee, and others, are unequivocally of the opinion that the island of Cuba is being used intentionally and purposely in a planned manner by the international Communist conspiracy for the purpose of subverting not only Cuba, which has already been accomplished, but other nations in this hemisphere. That program too is well on its way to accomplishment in a number of areas and if time permitted we could discuss the extent of the growth of the Communist Party in Puerto Rico, the extent of the growth of the Communist Party in the Dominican Republic, the happenings in Haiti with regard to Communists having a foothold there; we could discuss the Grand Cayman situation which arose just the other day where Great Britain is permitting Cuban planes to land and take off, and I understand now they have shifted their activity from Grand Cayman to Little Cayman, just a little bit to the north, because protests were received about that. We could talk about British Guiana and what Cheddi Jagan is doing there with regard to the encouragement of Communism and Communist activity; we could talk about Venezuela and the extent to which uprisings are occurring there, and the fact that humiliations never before known to any nation, particularly not known to the United States, have been caused by raids of Communists on the United States military installations there with instances of U.S. officers even being required to remove some of their clothing. All of this is being done at the instigation of the Communist movement which has as its base and foundation the activities running from Moscow through Cuba. I repeat, from Moscow, where the international Communist conspiracy has its fountainhead, through Cuba.

We could talk about Brazil and the fact that in the cabinet presently of the Brazilian Government are a number of known Communists; we could discuss the Communist subversion and the extent of it in Latin America without any fear of contradiction, and go on ad infinitum.

Now what is being done about it? We have heard a lot today about general recommendations made by a number of Members and many of them are extremely sound and most of them have been made before, but the important thing is practically all of them are being ignored.

The concern of many of us has been the fact that there is no policy relating to getting rid of Castro and communism in Cuba at the present time. Certainly there is none that could accomplish the objective. Why, we saw just the other day the situation where seven or eight of the Organization of American States nations refused to follow our leadership in trying to find ways to cut off economic assistance and to cut off travel of subversive trainees to Cuba from Latin American nations because seven or eight of those Organization of American States nations refused to join us in that effort.

Why are we not making any real headway? Where are all these gains that are being claimed for freedom in this hemisphere by this administration? Why are not the Alliance for Progress funds being used for the purpose of accomplishing freedom in this hemisphere through other nations in this hemisphere? Why are not Alliance for Progress funds being withheld from the five Latin American nations that still recognize Cuba? Some of these nations still do business with Castro, and I am talking principally now about Mexico, although there are others that still do business with Castro, and I am talking principally now about Mexico, although there are others that still do business with Cuba and still get our Alliance for Progress funds. If you want something concrete, why does not the administration withhold Alliance for Progress funds or use it as a lever at least to require these nations to withdraw recognition and support of Cuba or stop doing business with Castro in Cuba?

No, this is not being programed. And as a matter of fact the administration has announced that it does not have the intention of doing so, as they said in a letter to me, in discussing that matter.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask you this question: What is happening now with regard to the military buildup in Cuba? Yes, we had the blockade. And I say this to my friend from Illinois. What happened after the blockade? Why did we let our guard down? Why did we not insist on doing those things that would have given us unequivocal assurance that missiles were out of Cuba, offensive missiles and other offensive weapons? And one of which is on-site inspection. Anyone can refer to the report of the Selden subcommittee, as well as the hearings of that subcommittee, as well as the Stennis committee, and he will come to the unequivocal conclusion that the only way we can be assured missiles have been withdrawn is by an on-site inspection. Even today—evidence is very substantial that a number of missiles were hidden in the caves or at least the caves are there and substantial activity is going on. But we have no absolute proof that all missiles were actually removed from Cuba. That is what those reports and hearings indicate. And the only way it could be proved would be by on-site inspection, according to the Stennis report.

Now, what happened? Why did we drop our guard? We had the Communists on the run. We could have had on-site inspections. Why did we not

insist upon on-site inspections so that the security of this hemisphere would have been assured? Today it is a question mark. What is going on in this island?

My distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. HALEY] mentioned the Isle of Pines today. Reports are coming out of Cuba from some of the refugees who came across in these ships, some of those who were prisoners on the Isle of Pines, that there is a tremendous Communist activity and buildup there. They say that the Isle of Pines is the transshipment point for arms drops to Latin America, and that the Russians are now asking that the Isle of Pines be turned over for use exclusively by the Russians for such arms buildups and as an available depot for arms drops to other Latin American countries.

Reports are persistent from the islands on the north shores of Cuba that there is constant military buildup in a secretive manner, with not even the Cubans being permitted to be on the islands to see what is going on. How, then, can we be assured of what is going on in Cuba?

Air surveillance? What is happening with regard to air surveillance? In recent months low-level flights have been discontinued. I repeat, in recent months low-level flights have been completely discontinued. Higher surveillance flights have been curtailed substantially. So how do we know what is going on in Cuba? But more important, what steps are we taking to make certain of what is going on in Cuba, looking to the security of this hemisphere, that it be adequately protected? I say not enough. I say we should reinstate low-level surveillance flights so that we will know what is going on with regard to our security as it relates to Cuba. We should also insist on on-site inspections and let Castro defend his refusal to permit this proof of nonaggression intent to the world.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman from Virginia will permit me to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, I should be glad to yield.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there are several people who are scheduled to take time, but because of the questions that have been raised by the gentleman from Florida, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for 2 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Florida asked me if I might venture a guess as to what happened to on-site inspections. The gentleman recalls that negotiations were held and Mr. Castro just flatly refused. Is the gentleman suggesting that we ought to send in the marines and establish an on-site inspection beachhead? Is that the answer?

If the gentleman wants to send troops in there, let him say so. Why does he not say so?

Mr. CRAMER. The answer is that we should have kept up the Cuban blockade until we got on-site inspection. But instead of that, we withdrew it. We cannot let Castro dictate our policies un-

less we want failure. And Castro at that very time, on October 28, had the intestinal fortitude to make five demands on the free world, the United States in particular, even while the quarantine was in effect; and we have given in on two of them already, his demands that the United States stop all commando raids and arms drops from our shores and secondly from Puerto Rico.

Mr. PUCINSKI. All of them were rejected.

There is one point the gentleman makes. The gentleman has made this statement before, and I have listened to it with great interest, about this on-site inspection. I am for on-site inspection and I am sure everyone else is. But the gentleman has never come right out and said, "If we cannot get on-site inspection, let us invade Cuba." Why does he not make that statement if that is what he wants?

Mr. CRAMER. I have listened to this for a long time. The gentleman is preaching a war-scare, do-nothing approach. If we are to do nothing because of a war scare than we would do nothing—period. You have constantly protested against anybody making concrete recommendations about what should be done about Cuba, on the basis that if anybody really wants to do anything about Cuba now, they are calling for an invasion. That is about as asinine a position as could be taken, and the purpose is to poison the well. Too many in high places today are preaching this war-scare psychosis as an excuse for inaction. Anything being said by anybody but the administration is interpreted by the administration, and the President, as a call for war. Do the critics of this administration's Cuban policy want to go to war? Of course not. But they do want action now which is the best deterrent against a full-scale war later. Nobody wants to go to war. You are rendering a disservice to this great Nation when you suggest, in downgrading proposals made, that anybody on this floor, myself included, wants war. It is not necessary that we go to war with regard to Cuba. There are many steps that can be and should be taken that are far short of war. Until we take those steps, nobody knows what the ultimate steps must be to get rid of communism. But if military action is the only way to get rid of Castro after all other steps are taken, and the evidence convinces most people who have looked into this matter that this military buildup and subversive activity is continuing at a very substantial rate, if it is essential in invoking the Monroe Doctrine and that means kicking the Communists out of Cuba to preserve our security, that is the step we are going to have to take. But I say there are many other steps, some of which have been proposed, that we could and should take, all short of war and I will develop the rest of them in a moment.

We could invoke a complete trade ban, not one with loopholes as the present one has, but one that would cut off all trade between this country and other free nations with Cuba. Our foreign-

aid bill was amended and passed to accomplish this. The mandate was written into the law passed last year by the Congress of the United States, Public Law 87-872. The mandate was written in there, and I am sure the House is familiar with it. It is a mandate relating to strategic materials and specifically refers to petroleum, denying foreign aid to any nation shipping such materials to Cuba. I listed earlier in the discussion nations that are shipping petroleum to Cuba in direct violation of that mandate. If the administration really wants to do something, the least it could do would be to uphold and carry out the laws of the United States as enacted by the Congress of the United States, and not spend money in contravention of this mandate which was in the appropriation bill on foreign aid.

The second provision in Public Law 87-872 requires no aid to any country that is carrying on any trade with Cuba unless the President advises the committees of Congress his reason for permitting such aid despite such trade. No such advice has come to Congress—and aid is still going to countries doing business with Castro—again in direct violation of the law.

Now we should recognize, as has been said before, and by myself for many months, a government in exile. As a matter of fact, during the campaign I remember well the President's reference a number of times to the need for a government in exile and suggested that was one of the solutions to the problem.

We should have adequate patrols to prevent arms drops in the Caribbean. We do not presently have adequate patrols. Arms drops are presently taking place and have been taking place for some time.

What are we going to do about it? We have not beefed up our military sufficiently to provide adequate surveillance. Everybody knows that.

What are we doing to prevent travel to Cuba for subversive training—even from the United States? You see these are the things that are bothering the American people. Why are U.S. citizens even being permitted to still go to Cuba? Ninety-seven of them last year, in 6 months. Why are they permitted to go? And only one so far has been prosecuted, Mary Levi Travis?

Why are 58 American students presently in Cuba extolling the virtues of the Cuban revolution erroneously? Why were they permitted to go? Why? And as I stated on the floor, so far the State Department has announced that their only intention is to withdraw their passports and not prosecute the leaders who perpetrated this thing?

What is being done with regard to the other Latin American countries in cutting off this travel and subversive training from these other Latin American nations?

When are we going to announce without equivocation our intention to take the steps necessary to rid this hemisphere of communism? Some of them I have mentioned. Some of them have been mentioned on the floor. One was a restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point my resolution on this subject, House Joint Resolution 227, which was introduced on February 4 of this year, and which does what the Congress refused to do last year on the floor of this House when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] by amendment brought this up. My resolution clearly restates the Monroe Doctrine and calls for its full implementation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

H.J. RES. 227

Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety"; and

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations"; and

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extracontinental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union"; and

Whereas the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence, despite the fact that such action is clearly in violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the principles of self-determination and human freedom; and

Whereas due to the continuing inaction and indecision of the United States Government and the following offensive weapon "quarantine" of Cuba in October 1962, and commenting on the negotiations entered into between Khrushchev and the United States, mostly secret in nature, including the abandonment of on-site inspection of offensive weapons in Cuba, Khrushchev has enunciated and is implementing the "Khrushchev doctrine" as a replacement for the Monroe Doctrine as he restated the Communist aims in the Western Hemisphere at the recent Supreme Soviet when he stated: "Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba."; and

Whereas Castro, on January 16, 1963, announced his intention to use his externally supported massive military power to continue the enslavement of the Cuban people and to "bring the masses to battle" through revolution in Latin America; and

Whereas if the Monroe Doctrine is to be preserved it must be restated and fully enforced at this critical period when commu-

nism is openly and notoriously arming Cuba with massive modern weapons, tens of thousands of Russian troops, technicians and advisers, electronic missile jamming and tracking devices and "fishing" ports capable of accommodating Russian missiles, all of which constitutes a military capability of such proportions that it is offensive in nature and design: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States is determined—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the international Communist movement operating through the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from enslaving the people of Cuba and threatening the security of the Western Hemisphere, and from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability enslaving the freedom-loving people of Cuba and endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

SEC. 2. That the Congress of the United States urges the President, in accordance with existing law, to take, and supports him in taking, jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, economic, or military action as may be necessary to implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere and to continue to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom.

Mr. CRAMER. I also would like to place in the RECORD a resolution by the gentleman from Montana and a similar resolution submitted with regard to a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution and restatement referred to are as follows:

H.J. RES. 498

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

(a) That the United States regards the Monroe Doctrine as continuing to be fundamental to its foreign policies;

(b) That the United States regards the existence of a military base in Cuba supported by Soviet equipment and Soviet personnel as a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine;

(c) That the objective of the policy of the United States with relation to Cuba must be—

1. Termination of Soviet intervention;
2. Establishment of conditions under which the Cuban people may freely exercise their right to self-determination;
3. An end to Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against the people of the Western Hemisphere.

RESTATEMENT AND FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF MONROE DOCTRINE RELATING TO CUBA AND COMMUNIST SUBVERSION CALLED FOR

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN], chairman of the Republican Task Force on Cuba and Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere, having the privilege myself of being vice chairman of this task force, in calling for the restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. The Republican policy committee and the Republican National Committee have recently endorsed this position.

I am particularly encouraged that this position, as reaffirmed by the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Montana, is firmly announced by the Republican Party, having introduced a similar resolution, House Joint Resolution 227 on February 4, 1963. It is becoming more and more obvious that the New Frontier is seeking "accommodations" with the Communists throughout the world as well as in this hemisphere.

The aim of today's resolution and House Joint Resolution 227 is the implementing of such political, diplomatic, economic or military action as may be necessary to enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere.

The failure of the President to take any firm and meaningful action with regard to the Communist threat in Cuba and throughout this hemisphere makes it incumbent upon the Congress to express its position in a resolution of this nature.

I do not believe the American people or the Congress can long condone the New Frontier apathy that exists toward this very real threat to the peace and security of all the Americas—which is leading the United States toward a coexistence accommodation with Communists.

The President has recently called for a "reexamination of our attitude toward the Soviet Union." Our reexamination should be one looking toward a tougher policy.

In light of the recent reports by the Organization of American States, the Stennis committee and Selden subcommittee reports, pointing to Communist infiltration and subversion in this hemisphere, a reaffirmation and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine would be an obvious necessary start toward a tougher, more realistic policy toward Soviet influence in this hemisphere.

I am gravely and deeply concerned about the signs that point toward seeking an "accommodation," an expression used by the President at his American University commencement address this year in redefining the New Frontier foreign policies in calling also for a reexamination of our attitude toward the Soviet Union—in Cuba and elsewhere.

I am concerned when we open up commercial air corridors to nonscheduled airlines owned and operated by Castro's Communist government over the United States as was done a few weeks ago by a regulation of the FAA—so long as these planes going to and from Canada, trading with Canada which is a country for transshipment from many of the Iron Curtain countries, stop in one of our major cities for inspection—one of which is Dulles Airport outside Washington, D.C. Thus, Castro's planes can be flying over and landing within a few miles of the National's Capital. Apparently the quid pro quo for this "accommodation" is that Cuba will now guarantee safety of U.S. commercial airplanes over Cuba and the FAA has issued an order permitting such flights.

Perhaps this is why the New Frontier is so unconcerned about Russian trawlers violating our territorial waters.

Perhaps this is why little is being done to discourage other free nations from trading with Cuba—a practice that is ever increasing in recent weeks. I cite as justification for this Monroe Doctrine resolution introduced today and House Joint Resolution 227 the second interim report of the Subcommittee on Special Projects on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere.

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CUBA AND SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE—A TASK FORCE OF THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL PROJECTS

PREAMBLE

Within the past week the President of the United States has made a foreign policy ad-

dress calling for a reexamination of the attitude of Americans toward the Soviet Union. The theme of this address was that the Soviet Union could be led to adopt a more enlightened attitude if the United States changed its attitude toward peace and put aside its belief that the Russian people are lacking in virtue.

It must be presumed that the purpose of the President in making his remarks of June 10 was to indicate the direction of American foreign policy. We believe that the President is completely wrong in believing that the attitude of the American public toward the Soviet Union is a major cause of the Nation's conflict with communism and that Khrushchev's heart can be melted if this Nation adopts a more cordial attitude toward him.

It seems to us tragically irrelevant for the President to urge upon the Nation a deeper admiration of the Soviet Union for such attributes as courage and industry at a time when the ink is hardly dry on an OAS report declaring "intervention by Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere, by way of Cuba, has increased considerably during the past year."

The report which follows is offered in the hope that it will direct attention back to the type of basic decision that must be made by the leaders of this Nation in order to win the cold war.

SECOND INTERIM REPORT

The Nation needs a Cuban policy. It has no Cuban policy primarily because the President and the Democratic Congress have failed to make up their minds about the Nation's goal.

To a President who is fond of nautical metaphors, we say that a course cannot be charted until the port which we want to reach has been determined. Until the destination has been firmly fixed, the Nation will continue to drift.

The statements so far issued by administration leaders to define the goal of Cuban policy have been ambiguous, inconsistent, and incomplete. The joint congressional resolution signed by the President on October 3, 1962—perhaps the most authoritative statement of the national policy goal—is deficient in clarity, in comprehensiveness, and in courage.

Consequently, the Congress should adopt, and the President should sign, a new joint resolution stating the goal of the policy of the United States toward Communist Cuba.

THE AMBIGUITY OF THE GOAL OF CUBAN POLICY

The joint congressional resolution, like the President's statements of September 4 and 13, 1962, expresses opposition to the establishment in Cuba of an offensive military capability which threatens the security of the United States or of other nations in the hemisphere. It expresses opposition to the export of communism to other Latin American nations by force or the threat of force.

It is silent, however, on the attitude of the United States toward a Soviet military presence in Cuba which is defensive in character or which does not immediately threaten the security of the United States or of other American nations. It is silent on the attitude of the United States toward Communist subversion carried on by means other than the use or threat of force.

Many of the statements that relate to our Nation's goals are open to the interpretation that this Nation is ready to coexist with a Communist Cuba if it or Cuba does not seek to impose communism on other nations.¹ They suggest that a Soviet presence in Cuba

which does not involve offensive weapons, though abnormal, is something which our Nation can live with.

Confusion about the objective of our national policy is reflected in the utterance of the President as well as in those of lesser leaders of the administration. The President has refrained from reaffirming or repudiating the Monroe Doctrine but has offered a truncated version of the doctrine, which one administration lieutenant called the Kennedy doctrine.² The President spoke boldly before the released Cuban prisoners about the return of their flag to a free Havana in Miami in December 1962. But, less than 3 months later, at San Jose he omitted from his remarks the statements in his prepared text calling for a restoration of freedom to Cuba. The Vice President said, "We want to get rid of Castro," only to have this declaration revised by McGeorge Bundy to read "we cannot sympathize" with Castro's "course of policy" and "we must range ourselves" against it.³

From time to time the administration has given the impression that the presence of Soviet troops and military equipment in Cuba produces important advantages for the United States. Sometimes it is said that the Soviet presence makes Cuba "a showcase of Communist failure" and turns the people of other Latin American states away from Communists. Sometimes it is said that the maintenance of Soviet forces in Cuba imposes an economic strain on the Communist world. Sometimes it is said that the Soviets exercise a restraining influence on the volatile Cuban Government.

The inadequacies of statements of policy would be less important if the actions of the administration revealed a consistent and purposeful movement toward a clearly recognized objective. But the actions of the administration have been an inconsistent as its words.

The Attorney General, who said in April 1961, "The neutrality laws were never designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believe" has confined a score of Cuban exile leaders to the Miami areas. He has shown great vigor in providing immunity from exile attack to Cuba and to Cuban shipping. The President, who declared that the quarantine of last October would be maintained until United Nations inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles was obtained, ended the quarantine without securing on-site inspection to verify the removal of the missiles.

There can be no doubt that the administration would prefer that the Soviet Union pull out of Cuba and that it hopes that Castro will disappear. This wishful thinking, however, does not constitute a policy goal. There is a world of difference between a wish that the existing situation change and a determination to do all within our power to bring about a change.

A PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CUBAN RESOLUTION

This Nation has a historic policy opposing intervention in this hemisphere by despotism

with which the United States could coexist?⁴ Is the administration "looking toward some kind of reconciliation, perhaps on the basis of a Tito-type arrangement for Cuba?"

"The President has been careful not to declare openly that the Monroe Doctrine either does not apply in the Cuban case at this particular time or that it is an obsolete political concept in terms of present-day realities. But the administration spokesmen have made it fairly clear that the President does not believe that the Monroe Doctrine is really applicable under the present circumstances." Ted Szule, New York Times, Sept. 23, 1962.

"Issues and Answers" ABC-TV Oct. 14, 1962.

based in other parts of the world—a policy laid down on December 2, 1823, by James Monroe.

President Monroe asserted that "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing" Latin American states "or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any light, than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States." He warned that "we should consider any attempt" on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The Monroe Doctrine barred any further "interposition" by European powers to extend their system or exercise control in this hemisphere. It said simply, "Hands off." It made no distinction between offensive and defensive weapons or between forcible and pacific means of intervention.

The purpose of the Monroe Doctrine, as Elihu Root once explained, was to prevent the development of a situation that could endanger hemispheric security. The Kennedy doctrine, by contrast, appears to permit intervention by non-American states in this hemisphere up to the point at which a danger to security has reached an acute stage. The difference between the Monroe Doctrine and the Kennedy doctrine is the difference between preventative medical care and treatment which begins after the development of a high fever.

In earlier periods of our history the Government of the United States asserted that the Monroe Doctrine barred the presence of Spanish troops in Santo Domingo and the establishment of a French puppet emperor in Mexico. In 1940 Secretary of State Cordell Hull served notice that the Monroe Doctrine prohibited the exercise on any authority by Axis Powers over any part of the hemisphere.⁵ In 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt extended the Monroe Doctrine to Greenland and sent American troops to that island to forestall Nazi occupation.

In 1912, when Mexico proposed leasing to a Japanese fishing company, a port area in Lower California, the U.S. Senate, relying on the Monroe Doctrine, asserted " . . . when any harbor or other place in the American Continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for national purposes."

In 1954 Secretary of State John Foster Dulles declared that "the intrusion of Soviet despotism (in Guatemala) was a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies." With the assistance of the United States,

"It is interesting to note that the argument used by Hitler's government and rejected by Hull in 1940, contending that U.S. participation in the affairs of Europe made the Monroe Doctrine obsolete, was adopted by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN.

"The nonintervention in the affairs of the American Continent by European nations which is demanded by the Monroe Doctrine can in principle be legally valid only on condition that the American nations for their part do not interfere in the affairs of the European Continent," Von Ribbentrop, July 1, 1940.

"This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe," Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Sept. 20, 1962.

¹ The uncertainty about the Nation's objectives is evidenced in a recent report from Freedom House entitled "What Can We Do About Cuba?" The report, stating the consensus of the deliberations of 25 experts on Cuba in late April 1963, declares that the following are troubling questions: "Is American Cuban policy geared to a negotiated accord with Khrushchev on the kind of Cuba

loyal Guatemalans removed their Communist rulers forthwith.

Along with the United States, the other nations of the hemisphere have used the language of Monroe to serve notice that trespassing is forbidden to communism. The Ninth Inter-American Conference at Bogotá in 1948 condemned "interference by any foreign power, or by any political organization serving the interest of a foreign power, in the public life of the nations of the American Continent." The 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas in 1954 declared that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of any extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America."

Three years ago Khrushchev told the world that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, saying "the remains of this doctrine should be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay." The Eisenhower administration replied, " * * * the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed." The Kennedy administration has so far failed to contradict Khrushchev either by word or by deed.

What is needed is the positive policy of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is being violated by the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba—whatever their strength, whatever the nature of their equipment.

The doctrine is being violated as long as there is any type of Soviet intervention in Cuba.

The removal of Soviet troops and the elimination of other types of Soviet intervention in Cuba is an urgent policy objective.

The ultimate objective of U.S. policy must be the elimination of the Communist regime in Cuba and its replacement by a government freely chosen by the Cuban people. Let the President and the Congress act.

APPENDIX I—ATTITUDES ON THE SCOPE AND STATUS OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE BY RESPONSIBLE SPOKESMEN OF THE LAST FOUR ADMINISTRATIONS

Franklin D. Roosevelt (1933-45), Cordell Hull, July 5, 1940:

"The Monroe Doctrine is solely a policy of self-defense, which is intended to preserve the independence and integrity of the Americas. It was, and is, designed to prevent aggression in this hemisphere on the part of any non-American power, and likewise to make impossible any further extension to this hemisphere of any non-American system of government imposed from without. * * * It made clear that the future transfer of existing possessions to another non-American state would be regarded as inimical to the interests of this hemisphere. This has become a basic policy of the Government of the United States."

Cordell Hull, April 12, 1940:

"There is an express application of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States regarding Greenland. There appears to be no serious question about Greenland forming part of this hemisphere as contradistinguished from the European side of the Atlantic. * * * The German forces occupying Denmark could easily cause the Government of Denmark to issue order about Greenland, as they could about Danish shipping throughout the world. For this reason it's important that Greenland should receive our attention under the Monroe Doctrine."

Public Law 32, 77th Congress, approved April 19, 1941:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (1) That the United States would not recognize any

transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

Harry S. Truman (1945-53), President Truman, December 27, 1945:

"We believe that the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere, without interference from outside the Western Hemisphere, must work together as good neighbors in the solution of their common problems."

President Truman, April 5, 1947:

"When we hear the cry of freedom arising from the shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote: 'Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another.'

"We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

"We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

"We, too, have declared our protest.

"We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

"We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say 'We don't want war.' We must act in time—ahead of time—to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world."

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953-61), John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"This intrusion of Soviet despotism [in Guatemala] was, of course, a direct challenge to our Monroe Doctrine, the first and most fundamental of our foreign policies."

John Foster Dulles, June 30, 1954:

"If world communism captures any American state, however small, a new and perilous front is established which will increase the danger to the entire free world and require even greater sacrifices from the American people."

John Foster Dulles, March 4, 1954:

"It is time to make it clear with finality that we see that alien (i.e., Communist) despotism is hostile to our ideals, that we unitedly deny it the right of prey upon our hemisphere and that if it does not heed our warning and keep away we shall deal with it as a situation that might endanger the peace of America * * *. There is no place here for political institutions which served alien masters."

Henry Cabot Lodge, June 20, 1954:

"I say to you, representative of the Soviet Union, stay out of this hemisphere and don't try to start your plans and your conspiracies over here."

Department of State, July 14, 1960:

"The principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the Doctrine was proclaimed."

John F. Kennedy (1961 to date), John F. Kennedy, September 13, 1962:

"Question. Will it require force to contravene the Monroe Doctrine or does the presence of a foreign power in any force, but not using that force in this hemisphere, amount to contravention of the doctrine?"

"The PRESIDENT. Well, I have indicated that if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive action against the United States, that the United States would act. I have also indicated that the United States would not permit Cuba to export its power by force in the hemisphere."

Congressman WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, September 26, 1962:

"I think if a determination is made that the buildup in Cuba reaches a point where it

is a threat to the United States, then it is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, September 20, 1962:

"This change has greatly altered the conditions governing our implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was based in part on the assumption that the nations of the Western Hemisphere would remain uninvolved in the conflicts of Europe. But in discharging our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine, we must act with full regard for the fact that the problem of Cuba and of Communist designs in the Western Hemisphere is not an isolated one but part of our worldwide struggle against Communist imperialism."

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, September 20, 1962:

"How can we justify saying we object to the Russians being in Cuba when we have a base within 60 miles of the Russian border in Turkey? I have been at our airbase in Turkey, 60 miles from Russia. How can we justify that and at the same time object to the Russians being in Cuba?"

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, September 20, 1962:

"The Monroe Doctrine has been altered because we have foreign commitments and responsibilities.

"I submit, therefore, that we can neither morally nor realistically take action which would jeopardize the security and independence of our allies.

"It is not the same Monroe Doctrine as that of 1823; and our historians have been reporting that fact to us for some decades. They are correct."

Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, September 26, 1962:

"The Monroe Doctrine of 150 years ago has been amended by the necessity of a Kennedy doctrine which recognizes that a few sailing ships and men armed with muskets differs critically from a thoughtless armed action which can escalate into a nuclear holocaust and incinerate the Western Hemisphere."

Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, September 28, 1962:

Mr. HOLLAND inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was entitled, "Monroe: Obsolete Doctrine." The editorial said, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead." Congressman HOLLAND called it (p. A178) "An excellent editorial on the present 'hot' cold-war situation. * * * It is good to know that we have responsible and levelheaded publishers and editors throughout the Nation who are dedicated to reporting the facts."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, is there any doubt what the intention of communism is in this hemisphere? Castro has stated it as clearly and unequivocally as he could. Khrushchev has stated it as clearly and unequivocally as he could as I cited in my resolution.

What is bothering many of us further are the accommodations that are being sought and being accomplished between this Government and that of Cuba and Castro.

We are concerned about flights being permitted to fly over the United States with the acquiescence and the approval of the Federal Aviation Agency—that is nonscheduled Cuban flights.

We are all concerned about Canadian flights over the United States trading with Cuba.

We are concerned about these trade loopholes I mentioned.

We are concerned about this travel to Cuba.

We are concerned about the fact that the United States demanded no further

refugee raids not only from the United States but from Puerto Rico as well. I repeat—that was the first of Castro's demands on October 28 of last year when the blockade was in effect—that we must stop all refugee raids on Cuba. This has been accomplished as an accommodation.

We ought to require adequate surveillance of these Communist arms drops to these other countries in this hemisphere.

We are also concerned about this latest deal or accommodation that is being discussed.

I am reading from the Washington News of Friday, the 26th:

The spokesman for a commercial refugee transportation project from Havana to Miami says about 600 Cuban refugees will arrive here by boat within the next 10 to 14 days.

The refugees will be the vanguard of an attempt to remove about 325,000 Cubans from the Communist island who hold U.S. visa waivers, attorney Jack Nageley said yesterday.

Mr. Nageley represents Harold Derber, president of Empress Lines, Ltd., promoters of the project.

I called this to the attention of the House last week. Apparently a deal has been made with Castro so far as this company is concerned, to open up the shipping lines between Key West and Havana.

I made a protest about this, and I hope it is not accomplished. But in investigating this matter I found out this interesting fact. That following the quarantine there were 19 air repatriation flights in which some 87 to 160 persons claiming U.S. citizenship and their immediate dependents were permitted to come back to the United States. Then Castro cut it off. This following information is what I am talking about when I talk about deals and accommodations.

On February 27 a negotiation took place between the Castro government and someone on behalf of the United States. Through the Swiss Embassy, the State Department advises. Through James Donovan other sources advise.

Five ships have come through as a result of the deal that was worked out. Some 4,100 passengers from Cuba have been brought to this country. Of those, do you know who named 50 percent of them under this deal? Do you know who decided who 50 percent of these people coming into the United States on these 5 ships should be? Fidel Castro is who. The ships were the *Survey*, two trips, the *Morning Light*, and the *Marinus*. The United States decided only who 50 percent of the people on these ships would be. Fidel Castro decided on the other 50 percent. This has nothing to do with the ransom deal. These are additional refugees permitted to be brought into this country. We named 50 percent of them, because of our interest, and justifiably so, in getting 900 additional Americans out of Cuba. But the price we had to pay was that Castro had the right to name the other 50 percent or 2,050 persons coming into this country on those ships in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are concerned about. Why should such deals as these be made with Fidel Castro?

Why should such accommodations as these be made? What does the rest of the world and what does Latin America think of such accommodations? They obviously think we are weak, that we do not have any real determination to meet this threat of Communism in this hemisphere. That is the concern of many of us—this sign of weakness, particularly to the Latin American nations. They understand and admire signs of strength—they justifiably abhor signs of softness and weakness.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude, permit me to say this: The Organization of American States is a fine instrument to accomplish the objective of getting rid of communism and subversion in this hemisphere. But only under one condition—strong U.S. leadership. Many Latin American governments acknowledge this privately. Only with strong unequivocal leadership, only, with a definite plan of action by the United States of America, can the growing Communist cancer in this hemisphere be stopped.

U.S. leadership is what has made the Organization of American States effective in the past. That is what has given us the results at the conferences that were mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver], in combating communism. It is because of the U.S. leadership. That is what has done it.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States permits a vacuum in this leadership to exist, which exists today, or to persist in permitting such vacuum as exists today, then the Organization of American States is not going to be the instrument through which this can be accomplished.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the United States announce a firm, positive, step-by-step plan of action intended to be taken and ask for support of the OAS. In my opinion you are not going to have these recalcitrant Latin nations that we have today with that firm leadership—and the first step is to restore and announce our intention to fully implement the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSH. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, but I would point out to the gentleman that several other Members hope to speak on this subject.

I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of his responding to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I do not think I shall consume that much time.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that no one will find violent disagreement with what the gentleman from Florida suggested. The program he suggests is one that has been discussed here on the floor of the House throughout the afternoon and I would support it. However, the point we made in the earlier colloquy is that it does not serve any purpose here to try to define or elaborate upon the methods and the steps which led to earlier failures, because if one wants to do that one would have to go all the way back to the Rio treaty which was signed by Mr. Dulles and which stated that no

American state shall interfere, overtly or otherwise, in the internal affairs of another American state.

Mr. Speaker, I protested against that treaty at that time, and I still protest against it today. Therefore, I think it is those who try to confuse the unity of America in trying to rid Cuba of communism by digging into these past actions who are really doing the great disservice to this country. I think those who really want to do something about Cuba and who are interested in getting rid of the Communists in Cuba will engage in the kind of discussions that we have had here today, where sound suggestions are made and where they are subject to full discussion by the Members of Congress.

I think that this kind of action on the part of the Congress will demonstrate not only to the administration and the people in the State Department but to all of our neighbors in South America, yes, throughout the world, and most important to Mr. Khrushchev and the Kremlin, that the Congress of the United States, speaking for the people of the United States, wants to do everything humanly possible to get the Communists out of Cuba and the Western Hemisphere just as quickly as possible.

I can only repeat to my friend from Florida this is the road to victory in the Western Hemisphere, not confusing the issue about whether or not we got on-sight inspection or did not get it. We did not get on-sight inspection because Mr. Castro did not want to agree to that. I said before and I will say again, those who say we ought to go in there and do it ought to go the full length and say "Let us invade Cuba." I say, as other gentlemen have said, there are other ways of bringing the Communists to their knees. Many of these ways were discussed today. There are other peaceful ways of ridding Cuba of communism. I feel certain that the day when communism will be driven out of Cuba is not too far away.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke during this special order today, including myself, may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for giving me this opportunity to participate in the discussion today. It is passingly strange, and certainly it is more than coincidental, that the two gentlemen who serve as coordinators for this particular emphasis on Cuba should come from the various States that they do. I refer to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver], who is one of the representatives from the great State of Pennsylvania where the first bells of freedom tolled many years ago for this country, and, then, also to the distinguished gentleman

from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], who represents a State which probably has given this Nation more of our leaders in the past than any other State in the Union—the man who represents the State from which Thomas Jefferson came, who said we should always oppose the forces of tyranny. It is passing strange that you who represent these particular States should be taking the lead in this discussion as we are trying to find a bipartisan approach to bringing liberty and freedom to the oppressed people of Cuba.

I was very interested in the discussion a moment ago as to whose fault it is that we are presently confronted with this great problem. As I heard the discussion I was reminded of the story that was told of the man who introduced a new deodorant and he merely called it "Stereo." It did not kill the odor, but it fixed it so you could not tell where it came from.

If we are going to try to place positively and affirmatively the fault for our present situation, then we can debate here ad infinitum, and we are going to defeat the very purpose of this discussion here today.

Our sole objective is to try to focus the attention of Congress, the administration, and the American people on this particular problem, with the hope of encouraging positive steps toward a solution to it. I do not care whether you would try to attribute it to past administrations or not. The fact is that the past administration is past, and any attempt to place blame there, although justified, serves to make a solution more difficult. We can only deal with the present administration, and we can only solve the problem as we have it today. So, as a consequence, I hope all of you will construe these remarks as being directed toward trying to find a solution to the problem, rather than trying to be especially critical of any particular administration or any particular action which has occurred in the past.

We do have a serious problem. I believe that this discussion here will silence, once and for all, those who have said that many of us have been only critical and never constructive concerning our foreign policy, or the absence of a foreign policy, in reference to Cuba. Because we, during the past two and a half hours, and probably for another half an hour or so, have repeatedly advanced concrete, positive programs with regard to something which should be done in order to rid the Western Hemisphere of this Communist cancer in Cuba. So I believe without question that the American people are no longer going to listen to the cry that there are many in Congress and throughout the Nation who will be critical of our foreign policy about Cuba but who are not offering constructive proposals for doing something positive about it.

We have had numerous proposals here, time and again, in which the speakers have said, "We support your proposals and we believe they deserve the serious consideration of Congress, of the Executive, and of the American people." So this discussion should silence once and for all those who would say that we

would be obstructionists, that we would be critical without offering positive alternatives for improvements in the relationships that exist between this country and Cuba.

Another thing that is very logical—and I believe a very helpful proposition as far as this discussion is concerned—is that this discussion should allay the fears of those who would say that any positive step would be an act of war and would precipitate a nuclear holocaust, or would bring about an escalation into a nuclear war. Franklin, I believe, said "I have no way to shed light upon the future except from the lamp of the past."

Let us look at our experience on this score, because every one of you and the others in this body and the American people do not want war. The American people have been the champions of peace and freedom from time immemorial. I have known war personally—and I am not being a demagogue here—as I am sure others of you have seen it in past wars. It causes me a great deal of concern to realize that we have weapons of destruction which are unimaginable, comparatively speaking, to the power and destruction which we had in World War II. Why, I understand even one nuclear submarine has sufficient destructive fire power on it to equal all of the combined bombs that were dropped during World War II. We do not want war, and I believe veritably that experience will show that the positive steps suggested here will not lead to war. Indeed, just the opposite may very well be true; they are necessary to preserve peace.

From time immemorial the Communists have proven they only recognize force. We can enter into treaties, we can try to bargain with them, but their basic principle is, "I will keep what I have, and we will bargain with what you have." We have to be firm and strong. Experience has shown that when we stood firm the Communists backed down. Look at what happened in October, and bear in mind that in October there were missiles on Cuba pointed toward this great land of freedom. There were approximately 20,000 Soviet soldiers in Cuba at that time. However, we took a firm stand in October, and, notwithstanding the facts that they had their missiles pointed toward us and that they had approximately twice as many Russian soldiers as they allegedly have now—and we do not have any truly accurate way of determining the correct number—there was no nuclear war. Is it not reasonable to conclude—and we all are logical and reasonable men—that if the Russians did not precipitate a war and did not move into war at that time when Cuba had the missiles which they presumably do not have now, and where they had twice as many men in Cuba, which they presumably do not have now, then how can we justifiably say, following logical reasoning, that if we were to take positive, definite steps at this time it would precipitate a nuclear war? History does not bear that out. We need to be firm and positive.

There is certainly one thing which will allow a continued buildup in Cuba and

which will allow a continued extension of subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere, and that is to continue doing nothing, to have half-hearted approaches. To be sure, we have imposed an embargo on the particular vessels which go into Cuba.

As someone pointed out earlier, this is about as ineffective as anything anyone possibly could propose. Some shipping lines will use only one vessel in trading with Cuba and then use all of their other vessels to come to the United States.

I would like to see us extend this embargo, making it not only apply to the individual vessel but, rather, applying it to the shipping line. We will say to him, Mr. Shipper, if you deal with Cuba, not only will that one vessel be prohibited from coming into our ports, but all of your vessels will be prohibited from coming here. And if that is not effective, let us go one step further and say to the foreign countries involved that if these shipping lines continue to trade with Cuba, then we will consider withholding foreign aid.

We need to take positive, definite steps. Unfortunately, with regard to any step that is proposed, the argument could be raised against it that it is a step of aggression and will precipitate a nuclear war. Let me say again, as I have underscored before, that if the Russians did not—and they did not—precipitate a war back in October when they were much stronger militarily in Cuba, then if we take positive steps in the way of extending and tightening our embargo and in the matter of recognizing some provisional, free Cuban government somewhere in the Western Hemisphere, those steps will not precipitate a war.

Over the last few months, we have had a lot of discussion on the subject of Cuba. I dare say that we have had no less than 75 individual resolutions which have been introduced, during my limited service here in the Congress of the United States. We can continue to discuss this matter, but I think it is high time that we do something to implement our discussions. Personally I am quite concerned, as I am sure most of you are, with the fact that so many of these resolutions that have been applauded by the American people and have been approved by many of you individually, have not been acted upon by the various committees of this Congress. I realize that we have serious domestic problems confronting us. But I will tell you truly that no problem is more important than this matter of Cuba.

We can talk to the uncommitted nations of the world until we are blue in the face and say that "if you side with us, we will fight for you." But they will take a look and say, "Well, what have you done to the Communist menace just 90 miles off your shoreline?" We can try to impress upon them that we are lovers of freedom and believe in going to any extent to keep the Western Hemisphere free from the Communists, but as long as we let Cuba remain in its present condition we are tilting at windmills. We may as well face up to it that all of these other actions, all of these other theoretical proposals, all sounding

as they might be, are going to amount to absolutely nothing in convincing the uncommitted nations that we will stand up for freedom as long as we allow Castro to remain and to keep the people of Cuba under bondage. It is a choice that we have got to make, and if the Executive is not willing to face up to it, we as Members of Congress must face up to it. The reason I say that is because, ultimately, it will be our responsibility if, as has been suggested, actual invasion might be necessary.

In that connection, America has never been a coward. America has never backed off in the matter of preserving freedom and giving freedom to the peoples of the world simply because it might mean war.

I repeat, as we stand firm in supporting these measures which have been proposed here, that I believe these will be the steps not toward the war which all of us wish to avoid, but these will be steps toward peace and toward the downfall of Castro and of all those who would follow his Communist line in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join in this discussion with great interest for as many of you know I have long been deeply concerned by these problems. I have some questions some observations and some recommendations.

When are we going to take affirmative action to get the Communists out of Cuba? When will we face up to the fact that no amount of help to other Latin or South American countries can be effective as long as the dike is breached in Cuba? When will we admit that as long as the Castro government receives massive aid from the Soviet Union, both military and economic, it is not going to fall from within?

It is little short of criminal that this Nation has not long ago acted firmly and decisively to run the Communists out of Cuba. The great majority of the American people would solidly support such a policy, even one in which the use of force might become necessary.

We look foolish urging Britain not to let the Communists take over British Guiana when Communists stole Cuba and are holding it right under our noses. British Guiana is nowhere near the concern to Britain that Cuba is to the United States. We are fine ones to urge leadership and decisiveness on others when we do not exercise it ourselves.

Under the separation of powers, the responsibility for Executive control of the Government is in the Executive, not the Congress.

We have passed resolutions asking the Executive to act in Cuba. Members of this body have spoken repeatedly indicating support for firm Executive action, yet none has been forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, the dismal truth is that we have no policy on Cuba to amount to a hill of beans. With all due respect to the various high offices involved in the executive department whose responsibility it is to deal with such situations, we have witnessed for far too long, adde-

headed, chicken-hearted, and ignorant timidity on the part of the American Government faced by Communist military action in Cuba. We once had a Monroe Doctrine, but you would scarcely know it in the State Department or the White House. We started on the right road in October only to abandon it in short order and then sit back while the situation has deteriorated to our disadvantage ever since.

It is astonishing but true that instead of building up and supporting Cubans who want to liberate their homeland and replace Castro with a government friendly to the United States, we have dispersed the Cubans all over this country. Hit-and-run attacks with their stimulus to morale and their obvious annoyance to the Communists we officially prevented. There has been no call or even demand by this country backed up by anything other than the usual diplomatic hogwash, to inspect the island of Cuba, although every person in the executive branch must admit that we do not know whether offensive missiles once there have all been removed or what has been brought back by submarine or in the dark of night.

To listen to the Department of State, one would get the impression that it is believed that there can be negotiations with Communists that will result in agreements that can both be relied upon for Communist performance and will operate in the interests of the United States if performed. This is a dismal ignorance of the true nature of the Communist beast. Communists and communism simply will not enter into any agreement that does not serve Communist purposes, nuclear test ban treaty or what have you. Neither will Communists perform any commitments undertaken by treaty or otherwise when it is in their interest not to perform. Communists are not ordinary, reasonable men and women, with conscience and honor and principle. Communists are 20th-century nihilists, international gangsters, ruthless murderers, saboteurs, espionage agents and atheists. Their single goal, their fanatic determination, their obsessed and obsessing objective is the destruction of this country by force or any way they can do it. Khrushchev was the butcher of the Ukraine. Does any one really believe he has changed? Do leopards change their spots?

Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how any government of this country regardless of party can make claim to the right to continue as a government when it fails the American people in this hour of need, in this crucial contest. No government worthy of the name can tolerate continued Communist military potential in Cuba or any other place in Central or Latin America. The political party of the Chief Executive makes no difference when it comes to such an issue. As Chairman of the Internal Security Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General in San Francisco in July of 1960, I was extremely critical of then President Eisenhower's lack of firmness in dealing with Castro's expropriations of U.S. interests in Cuba. At that time, more than 3 years ago, I spoke

of the construction in Cuba of Soviet missile launching bases. Let no man, whether he is President of the United States or the Secretary of Defense or the Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, claim that it was not and has not been known day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out, that the Communists in Cuba have been steadily building a military potential directed against the United States of America.

Consider carefully the full implication of these facts. It is a damning indictment of individuals and governments who call themselves American who want the checkcack, the black limousines, the titles and the rank but who when the chips are down have not got the guts nor the will to lead to win against the Communists.

This situation has not changed to date. We have no policy. We have no courage. We have no will to win at the top. And this is deeply distressing to men and women all over America—to Members of this House on both sides of the aisle who know that this is not properly a partisan problem.

And while I'm on the subject of the military buildup in Cuba, let me say this. We have not been told all about the bad things that have been built there. We the people have not had pictures of submarine installations nor reports of the locations and contents of the many hundreds of caves, nor the concrete works and the disappearing turrets, nor many such installations, none of which can fairly or justly be said to relate to the defense of Cuba. They are offensive, against the United States. They have no business being there, Mr. Speaker. They should be razed. They should be destroyed. Affirmative action to do this is not imperialism. Before God and in the name of justice and freedom no Communist government has a right to exist in this hemisphere except as its peoples may voluntarily elect it—which never happens.

Now what should be our policy? Three things are fundamental.

First. There must be a continuing inspection of all of the island of Cuba at will and on a daily basis by inspecting teams, preferably of the United Nations with United States membership, but if not, by United States inspecting teams. If this inspection discloses offensive weaponry of war—which it will—this weaponry should be dumped into the sea. Again, preferably by the United Nations with United States participation, but if not, by the United States alone.

Second. The United States should declare that Castro must go, and that he must not be succeeded by a Communist leadership, and that—and here is the important part, the teeth—this Government is prepared to blockade by sea, land, and air until Castro and communism withers on the vine. It may be that in the course of the withering there will be much suffering and perhaps some loss of life, but this is a small price to pay measured against the horrible destructions certain to be inflicted upon the United States and its allies from a Communist controlled and monitored Cuba, armed

to the teeth as an outpost as well as a staging and resupply area.

Third. This Government should announce that it is opposed to Communist governments in this hemisphere and is willing to use force if need be to prevent their establishment.

What about the inspections? Let us be frank. We know the United Nations will not order the inspections, so the United States must be prepared on the basis of the Monroe Doctrine and our national security to act outside the United Nations if necessary and to act soon. If this means Mr. Stevenson's resignation, that is tough turkey. If this means that some people are going to say that this Nation is a big bully and picking on poor little Cuba, that is tough turkey too. Because, believe me, this must be done. But then again, do not take my word for it. Ask the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Ask any military, naval or Strategic Air Command officer who has thought this thing through. They are to a man in favor of inspection of Cuba backed up by force.

Assuming then that the United States decides to proceed on its own initiative and independent of the United Nations, what course should we take? Inspection teams of perhaps 12 competent U.S. specialists composed of a majority of military personnel, but including civilian and scientific personnel, and photographic equipment, should be presented to the Cuban Government with a demand for the grant of continuing right to inspect the island of Cuba any place, any time. And, Mr. Speaker, again the teeth, because as we all know, requests in diplomatic language and letters of protest against Soviet shooting down our aircraft in times past and the like, do not get anywhere unless there is some teeth—this request should specify a time for the first inspection unit to arrive in Cuba and indicate explicitly that if denied permission to inspect we will commit military, naval, and air forces of the United States in support of such an inspection.

Now does this mean war? I do not believe it does. It may mean for a while some limited warfare. But it will not escalate to atomic destruction for one reason. This is because we have enough atomic deterrent staring the Communists in the face to incinerate the Soviet Union and every Communist country, even if they made an initial attack. And as long as this is the case, there will be no atomic warfare.

However, Mr. Speaker, if we wait, if we delay for more months and more years in eliminating this cancer in Cuba, the situation will only further worsen. There will be more Cubans indoctrinated in Moscow to hate us. There will be more subversives planted in Latin and South America. There will be more military equipment on the island of Cuba and a greater and greater export of it along with the Communist propaganda leaflets and unrest throughout this hemisphere.

We must act and act now. The risk of limited war is great, but no nation ever stayed on top nor lived up to its responsibilities as the champion of freedom

and justice that was unwilling to take risks.

I have used the phrase "tough turkey" several times. I have done this deliberately, because the Communists that we are up against are, indeed, tough turkeys. Given the opportunity, presented by the astonishing spectacle of a rich, fat, materially comfortable American Government unwilling to fight for freedom, these tough turkeys will take advantage of every means to build up their military and propaganda potential. This is not propaganda for a peaceable change to a different system. This is not the case of an ideological conflict. This is not a cold war in the true sense. It is hot. It is real. It is to the death. And Mr. Speaker, along with a good many millions of Americans, I have children and I want them to be able to start adulthood in a hemisphere that is free from communism. It is said that World War I was fought to make the world safe for democracy; World War II to preserve the world from the insane brutalities of Hitler's fascism. Today, under the umbrella of atomic stalemate, Communist military operations are proceeding to destroy our favorable balance of power because we have been unwilling to even risk limited warfare in the defense of freedom.

Are we decadent bourgeois? I wonder.

No foreign aid programs, no Alliance for Progress, no economic projects of any kind to invest strength and stability in Latin America can possibly be effective with a continuing Communist Cuba. If we fail to risk a showdown now to achieve a free Cuba, we will have to risk it when the next Latin American nation falls to communism, only to find us in a much more vulnerable position.

With the passage of time, this Cuban situation is not going to get any better. Khrushchev boasts of some kind of commitment that the President made him in return for having backed off at the time of the quarantine in October 1962. I understand there are some 40 letters between the American President and the Soviet dictator at this time. Yet, in spite of demands by the Congress, the representatives of the people, this correspondence has never been made public. Incidentally, neither was F.D.R.'s with Stalin—not even to this day.

The President, in a special address to the Nation and to the world after adequate consultation with the Secretary of State, with the Cabinet, with the National Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, should announce an American policy of firm insistence upon inspection of Cuba and that we will achieve such inspection by the use of military force if need be. Later on, in page 2, there must be the further policy position that the same principle will be of continuing application against any further or new attempt at Communist penetration of this hemisphere.

The vast majority of the people of this Nation would welcome such positive, pro-American, pro-national-security decisiveness. Such a program is militarily defensible. It is of urgent necessity if the national security is to be preserved against exposure to atomic attack, sub-

version, infiltration, guerrilla warfare, sabotage and espionage throughout the entire hemisphere. Nothing less is compatible with honor, with principle, with American tradition, with the Monroe Doctrine, with commonsense in awareness of the true nature of communism and the full meaning of its military offensive operations 90 miles from Florida.

Every hour that passes finds the situation materially worsening. The American Executive must act, and act now for God, for country, for our survival, and for our children's future.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, 1963, at Costa Rica, President Kennedy made this ringing statement:

We will build a wall around Cuba [not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire but] a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty.

He vowed fierce and unyielding resistance to the spread of foreign tyranny in the Western Hemisphere.

The Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuban nation into its despotic empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of Continental America—

Said the President.

At the Organization of American States, at this meeting and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion.

These words received by the listening Latin American Presidents at Costa Rica with hope and enthusiasm. However, the hard facts of the cold war and Cuba tell a different tale about the wall around Cuba and the spread of tyranny to Latin America.

Almost exactly a month before about the same time of the President's speech to our Latin American neighbors, the Nation's Intelligence Chief, M. R. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, reported to a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, that a dangerous, wide-spread, and highly organized Communist subversive apparatus was being built around Latin Americans trained in Cuba. He said that 1,000 to 1,500 trainees from every Latin American country save one, went to Cuba in 1962 to receive training in guerrilla warfare, sabotage and terrorism.

What can be done to transform the President's words into action? What can be done to stop the traffic of subversives between Cuba and Latin America revealed by our CIA?

There is a way and there is an organization to implement the way.

The Organization of American States is the oldest large organization of nations in the world, long preceding the League of Nations or the United Nations. All nations in the Western Hemisphere are members, save Canada.

One of its principal aims has been mutual security for the member nations. In 1940, at Havana, a resolution of the OAS declared:

July 29

12812

Any attempt on the part of a non-American State against the integrity of inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American State shall be considered an act of aggression against the states which sign this declaration.

In 1947, the American nations signed the Rio Treaty. This historic document is actually a collective defense treaty. Its purpose was to anticipate what has happened in Cuba and provide machinery to do something about it.

Now then, what does it provide. In article 6, if a situation endangers the peace of the Americas it states that the OAS should meet immediately to agree on measures for the common defense and for maintenance of peace and security of the continents.

Article 8 lists the measures which may be authorized and among them are: "partial or complete interruption of economic relations on rail, sea, air communications, and use of armed forces.

Most of the member nations are violently opposed to communism in general and the Castro regime in particular.

For example, at the meeting of the American foreign ministers on October 2 and 3, 1962, recognized in forceful language the threat of the Communist Cuba regime to all of Latin America.

During the Cuban crisis the OAS Council met on October 23, and adopted unanimously a resolution which: First, called for withdrawal from Cuba of all missile and other offensive weapons; and second, that member states, to be all measures, individuals, and collectively in dealing with the armed forces to insure that Cuba would not continue to receive military supplies from the Soviet bloc.

The OAS backed up the United States to the hilt.

Eight countries offered the United States military aid.

What does all this show? That what is urgently needed, what the nations of the hemisphere are crying for is forthright, aggressive leadership on the part of the United States. As the most powerful nation, as the leader of the free world, they must rely upon us to back them up in decisive action against Castro and communism. When we provided aggressive leadership, as in the beginning of the Cuban crisis, the Latin American States were solidly with us.

What can be done? One solution is simple. Overnight, much of the subversive pressures against Latin America from Cuba would be largely eliminated if this simple action was taken by the Organization of American States: First, forbid all travel between Cuba and the Latin American States; and, second, stop all trade between Cuba and the Latin American States; Castro's bad economic plight would be worsened.

Let us look at an example. The principal route of subversive trainees into and out of Cuba is through Mexico City and via Cubana Airways. Mexico is our closest Latin American neighbor. Vast quantities of American dollars in aid and in trade bolster the Mexican economy each year. It is time to talk turkey with Mexico and insist on her

putting an end to this pipeline of subversives.

This Nation has embarked in a massive foreign aid program in Latin America—the Alliance for Progress. The whole foundation for foreign aid program is to halt the progress of communism throughout the world. It occurs to me that a prerequisite of this aid should be cessation of trade with Cuba. What better way to fight communism?

If all of the members of the Organization of American States will not go along with this simple two-point program, then I suggest it is time to separate the wheat from the chaff—let us extend the hand of friendship and of aid to our friends and withdraw it from those who prefer to flirt with Castro and communism.

I say further that when we assume a role of clear-cut leadership in this hemisphere against Castro and communism, we will find the Organization of American States and its individual members rallying to our cause.

The Latins respect strength. We had no trouble getting their unanimous support during World War II against the Nazi-Axis aggression. Nor will we now in 1963 against the Communist goal of world conquest. If we will but assume the role of leadership in this hemisphere.

Most of the Latin American nations are openly and solidly with us, despite the Cuban fiasco. The rest will be with us when we start acting more like the great world power that we are.

I have not sought here to probe the many other measures that could be taken.

I have sought to point out that the Organization of American States can be an effective weapon in this cold war with communism in Cuba.

The Organization of American States is like a fertile field waiting eagerly the planting of the seeds of leadership. Let the United States plant these seeds of leadership, and reap the harvest of a strong hemisphere, free from foreign, Communist domination.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I join with my colleagues in bringing attention to the most serious international problem facing this Nation. It also is with great hope that I associate myself with this bipartisan group of eminent statesmen—hope that a solution presented here today will be accepted and vigorously implemented.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the word "hope" is the key to our dangerous predicament. By our spectacular failure to oppose the admission of Hungary's totalitarian Communist regime into the United Nations, we snatched hope away from the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe as though the torch of freedom had suddenly disappeared from the upraised hand of Our Lady of New York Harbor, the Statue of Liberty.

Likewise, this country's obvious accept-

ance of a totalitarian Communist regime in Cuba, crowned by the extreme measure of even hampering the operations of Cuban freedom fighters, has tarnished the hope held by western European countries in NATO to say nothing of the hopes of the Cuban people. To me there is little wonder that the much maligned President of France, Charles DeGaulle, has seen fit to involve his country in unilateral defense preparations. Whether this attitude is warranted by the facts is debatable. But the image of the United States as the great hope for the defense of freedom-loving peoples has been tarnished, and President DeGaulle is understandably alarmed.

This great Nation has led the tide for freedom and self-determination from the days of our colonial patriots. But now there are grave doubts in the minds of free peoples as to whether we are still leading this cause, whether we still are waving the banner of hope to those who are captives behind the Iron Curtain, whether we have traded total peaceful victory of freedom in exchange for appeasement of communism as it steadily takes over the world.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many proposed solutions to the problem of Cuba. Some of them tread on dangerous ground. Others are reasonable economic and political sanctions that could lead to gradual, peaceful rejection of communism in this hemisphere. I need not go into their provisions in detail here, but I will wholeheartedly pledge myself here and now to support and work for the enactment of any reasonable legislation that will restore the United States, in the eyes of the world, as the leader of freedom.

May I call the attention of this honorable body to the list of at least 22 measures aimed at the Cuban situation. I think that it is pertinent to note at this point that although this legislation is authored by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the administration has seen fit to give them the cold shoulder. For the sake of brevity, I will summarize their subject matter very briefly now, but will place their numbers and description in the RECORD for the convenience of the Members.

Monroe Doctrine: House Joint Resolutions 227, 237, and 278 would express the determination of the United States to implement the Monroe Doctrine.

Liberation of Cuba: House Joint Resolutions 229, 250, and 310 call for the liberation of Cuba by whatever action necessary and House Concurrent Resolution 22 also calls for release of U.S. citizens imprisoned in Cuba.

Bay of Pigs: Senate Resolution 54 and House Concurrent Resolutions 51 and 82 would authorize studies of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Economic sanctions: Senate Resolution 83 asks support for a free world embargo on Soviet shipments to Cuba; House Joint Resolution 244 urges the President to notify recipients of U.S. aid that general trade with Cuba will result in termination of such aid; H.R. 2657 and H.R. 3954 would prohibit the shipment in commerce of articles imported from Cuba; Senate Concurrent

Resolution 31 urges closing the Panama Canal to shipments of war material to Cuba; H.R. 2423 and H.R. 2494 would set the U.S. policy that foreign vessels used in trade with Cuba and certain other Communist countries may not carry cargoes under U.S. programs; House Concurrent Resolution 146 proposes that the United States urge the Organization of American States to impose economic sanctions against Cuba; House Joint Resolution 302 provides for reductions of future U.S. contributions to certain special aid programs of the United Nations if aid thereunder is given to Cuba.

Cuban refugees: House Concurrent Resolution 150 would establish a Cuban National Council as a rallying point for Cuban refugees and as a legal organization with which the United States and other countries could deal; House Joint Resolution 318 would create a Commission on Cuban Refugees to study the refugee problem and to relocate them throughout the United States.

Soviet military occupation: House Resolution 290 asks the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in demanding Soviet military withdrawal from Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, some of these proposals may constitute a solution, or an approach to a solution, to this serious encroachment into the Western Hemisphere. The solution may be among other proposals made to this body. Whatever it is, it must restore this Nation's prestige among our friends and the respect of our adversaries. It must elevate us again as the shining example of self-government for all nations, old and new, to emulate. And by our own individual example, we can show the freedom-loving peoples of the world how to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, like many of us here on this floor have done.

I have anxiously joined with my colleagues in this call for action on Cuba, Mr. Speaker. I am sure your mail shows, as mine does, that the American public is concerned with the administration's lack of policy and lack of action in this matter. How long can we afford a policy of inaction and still remain secure?

The hope of freedom-loving people throughout the world hinges on our providing the answer. It is time to move.

Let us show these friends that Uncle Sam still possesses a little guts and determination in carrying out our expected role of leadership.

The following bills have been introduced in the 88th Congress, 1st session concerning Cuba:

Senate Resolution 54, GOLDWATER: Authorizes a study of the facts surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion. January 23, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 51, MINSHALL: Authorizes a study of the facts surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion. January 24, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 82, MINSHALL: Establishes a special joint committee to conduct a full and complete study to determine the facts concerning the Bay of Pigs invasion. February 5, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 22, PEPPER: Expresses the sense of the Con-

gress with respect to citizens of the United States now unlawfully imprisoned in Cuba and the liberation of Cuba from the curse of Castro and communism. January 9, 1963.

Senate Resolution 83, MAGNUSON and MORSE: Expresses the sense of the Senate to support the American merchant marine's efforts to obtain a free-world embargo on Soviet shipments to Cuba. February 6, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 227, CRAMER: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom. February 4, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 229, JOHANSEN: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba. February 4, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 237, FULTON of Pennsylvania: Expresses the determination of the Congress that the United States maintain, implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout the Western Hemisphere. February 7, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 244, WATSON: Urges the President of the United States to advise all nations receiving aid under the foreign assistance acts that further commerce by such nations with Cuba in commodities—humanitarian items excepted—will result in termination of such aid. February 7, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 250, WILLIAMS: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba. February 11, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 278, HARSHA: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom. February 25, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 310, WYMAN: Expresses the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba. March 6, 1963.

House Resolution 290, PEPPER: Calls upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in demanding the Soviet Union to remove its armed forces from Cuba. March 11, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 150, WALLHAUSER: Expresses the sense of Congress that the President should provide for the establishment of a Cuban National Council. The Council would first provide a rallying point for the Cuban refugees in the Western Hemisphere; second, provide an effective legal instrument through which the United States and interested Latin American governments could offer material and financial aid, in the fight to regain freedom for Cuba; third, provide a focal point of communication with the freedom-loving fighters still carrying on inside Cuba; fourth, assure the Cuban people and the world that the United States is not accepting the Castro government as the permanent Government of Cuba; and fifth, lay the legal basis for domestic support for the activities of the Cuban refugees. May 8, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 318, PEPPER: Cuban Refugee Commission Act. Establishes a commission known as the Commission on Cuban Refugees, composed of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce, to conduct a program of relocation of the refugees from Cuba in Florida to other parts of the United States and to conduct a study of this problem. March 11, 1963.

House Concurrent Resolution 146, ROGERS of Florida: Expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should propose to the OAS that certain economic sanctions be taken against the Communist Government of Cuba. May 2, 1963.

H.R. 2657, DEVINE: Prohibits the shipment in commerce of articles imported into the United States from Cuba. January 24, 1963.

H.R. 3954, HEMPHILL: Prohibits the shipment in commerce of articles imported from Cuba and prohibits introduction into commerce any article intended for export to Cuba. February 21, 1963.

House Joint Resolution 302, MONTROYA: Provides for reductions of future United States contributions to certain special aid programs of the United Nations if aid thereunder is furnished to Cuba. March 4, 1963.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, SCOTT: Expresses the sense of Congress on closing the Panama Canal to ships carrying war materiel to Cuba. March 14, 1963.

H.R. 2423, PELLY: Declares as the policy of the United States that foreign vessels which trade with Cuba or certain other Communist countries may not participate in the carrying of cargoes under programs of the United States. January 21, 1963.

H.R. 2494, GARMATZ: Same as H.R. 2423. January 24, 1963.

H.R. 7687, ROGERS of Florida: Purpose to close U.S. ports to the ships of any nation which allows any of its ships to be used in sea trade with Cuba.

[Mr. BRUCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure to participate in this special order. I would like to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], and others who have arranged this discussion as a bipartisan effort to crystallize thought and inspire constructive action. My remarks shall be addressed to but one phase of this many faceted problem: "The Cuban Caves," which, to me, present a good example of the necessity of facts in facing a complicated matter. Facts coupled with firmness and sound judgment can go a long way toward solving complex problems.

Last winter when the great debate was raging as to whether or not the missiles had been removed from Cuba, it occurred to me it would be wise to find out if there was any place in Cuba where missiles could be hidden. On February 28 I called to the attention of the House a letter I had received from the Library of Congress in answer to my inquiry concerning the presence of caves in Cuba. I was surprised to find out that this was the first direct inquiry that had been made. I was also surprised to find that in the Library of Congress there was remarkably little information about the presence and size and location of caves in Cuba. It seemed strange to me then and it seems strange to me now that in a situation where we had complete access to the caves in Cuba for many, many years, our intelligence had not thought to look into such an important strategic potential which could be used contrary to the interests of our country.

Again, on March 7 of this year, I called to the attention of the House that altogether the Library of Congress did not have much information on caves in Cuba, this apparently had been a matter which had concerned Army intelligence. Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, actually stated there were indeed innumerable caves, in fact, countless thousands of caves in Cuba. He went on to point out that they were definitely large enough and suitable for storing military weapons, including missiles. He also revealed that aerial reconnaissance indicated roads recently built to known cave locations.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I called on the people of this country who might have knowledge of Cuban caves to send their information to the Library of Congress. It is interesting to note that as a result of this, many people indeed did send the Library of Congress information picked up over the years either as sightseers or archeologists or engineers working or visiting in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, on March 11 the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] inserted in the RECORD stories which appeared in the Chicago Tribune and Manchester Union-Leader, concerning this matter of Cuban caves and some of the response which had resulted from my previous insertions in the RECORD.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year I inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post on the secret caves of Cuba. This editorial wrapped up information then existing and pointed out the highly significant fact it was possible for some caves, fronting on the ocean, to contain submarine pens. There has been additional information since then which would lead us to believe this is so.

Mr. Speaker, when I inserted that editorial from the Saturday Evening Post I called to the attention of my colleagues the fact that this information had been sent to me by my friend, Ambassador Robert C. Hill, a constituent of mine who lives in Littleton, N.H. I think it is important to remember that Ambassador Hill, when Ambassador to Mexico, was not fooled by the Castro regime or the bearded demagog who heads it.

Had the Ambassador's earlier warnings been heeded many of the mistakes made since, might well have been avoided.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to cite a few additional facts which I think my colleagues should have: as a result of a recent questionnaire which I sent to my constituents, I am convinced that most of them are not satisfied with this administration's policy toward Cuba. I am also convinced of the fact that the American people dismiss as unwarranted the suggestion that those of us who are criticizing present policies toward Cuba are warmongers calling for an open invasion of Cuba. There are many effective measures (and many of them have been well detailed here this afternoon) that can and should be adopted which in no way involve direct military action.

Working much more closely with the OAS and bringing to bear the full economic power at our disposal is certainly one course of action that has not been vigorously pursued, and certainly should be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. MARSH. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I met with Ambassador Hill when he was here in Washington recently. He indicated that if we employ our full economic power and engage in skillful and concerted action through the OAS, the Castro regime could be brought to terms and brought down without the use of military force.

Mr. Speaker, we hear so often the unfounded criticism that those of us who challenge the wisdom of our present Cuban policy are warmongers calling for open invasion. We are accused of spoiling America's International Image.

It is becoming increasingly clear that a lack of firmness, vacillation, and lack of well-defined and well-prepared policy is what is really damaging our "image."

Mr. MARSH. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me. I join with those speakers today who have taken a bipartisan approach to this great American problem. This problem of how to win the minds and hearts of the people of this world to the idea of freedom that is best expressed in our American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here in this Congress to write history or to criticize history. We are here to try to understand history and to make history. It is in this spirit of making history that we should frame our remarks and continue our discussions. That is our responsibility. Let us leave the history writing to the historians.

To sum up briefly some of the things we can do short of armed conflict to rid Cuba of Castroism and communism, let me say first of all as a broad title we can cut off trade with Cuba. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], and myself and quite a few others have introduced legislation that would call for

the closing of all American ports to ships of any country that persist in trading with Cuba. I think all of us would see that immediately that would place upon our friends such as Great Britain who since the first of this year had 41 ships visit Cuba, some 13 of which were large tankers, the choice of whether they, the British, wanted to trade with us or trade with the Castro Communists. Of course, the answer to that would be easy. They would want to trade with us.

Thereby, we would throw the burden of supporting Communists upon those who should support it, their advocates, the Russians. I believe stretched as the Russian economy is that throwing this additional burden upon them of supporting Cuba would in time bring about the downfall of Cuba.

It would also serve to weaken the cause of Russian communism. We can also cut down Cuban trade by inserting provisions in future legislation that no country that continues to trade with the Communists will receive any foreign aid. We can close the gates of the Panama Canal to those who persist in trading with Cuba. We can insist that those countries who continue to fly airplanes into Cuba will no longer receive any foreign aid and that they no longer be permitted to trade with us. Also we can in Central and South America expand our educational and our cultural exchange program. We need to do this. We have been woefully neglectful in this area.

We can convert the technique and principles we have developed in selling our products throughout the world to selling this idea of freedom by expanding the operations of the USIA and other programs of this kind. In short, Mr. Speaker, there are many avenues of approach to the defeat of Cuban communism that we can and must follow. It is the responsibility of this Congress to make a vigorous start.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] for a period not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, today we have presented a coordinated bipartisan congressional review and recommendations on the cold war as it applies to Cuba. The problem has been communism in Cuba in respect to the Western Hemisphere. We have sought informally, with individualistic approaches, solutions so that we might eliminate communism from Cuba and this hemisphere.

The review and recommendations made have included the following basic points:

- First. U.S. action.
- Second. Role of the Organization of American States.

U.S. ACTION

I. Punta del Este Resolution No. 2: It is apparent that we in the United States must develop a determined and immediate liberationist policy to eradicate communism from Cuba. This we must make evident not only in the United States but to the people of Latin America. The Monroe Doctrine has been discussed as

to its reevaluation and application to the Cuban situation.

One of the more important additional actions which it is felt could be made is through reassertion of the Punta del Este Resolution No. 2. The implementation of this resolution, developed by the OAS nations, makes a firm commitment of American policy in relation to the Sino-Soviet bloc in Cuba. We feel under this resolution there is an opportunity for positive action which will show leadership as well as cooperation to the Latin American nations.

II. Economic blockade: There is a growing feeling for an all-out economic blockade of Cuba in which all U.S. ports of entry—air and sea—shall be closed to any nation dealing with the island country. The closing of the Panama Canal to Cuba and other countries dealing with them has been reemphasized. We must, likewise, persist in asking our western allies to desist from their dealing with Castro. A blockade of oil shipments of all nations to Cuba has been proposed.

III. Foreign aid program: Restrictions have been proposed on U.S. foreign aid to countries dealing with Cuba. This means that congressional foreign aid amendment will place restrictions on monetary, economic, and other forms of foreign aid to any country which deals with Castro.

IV. Provisional Cuban Government: It is evident that we need some means of coordinated information and action relating to the restoration of Cuba to democracy. Some feel that the recognition of a well-balanced and representative provisional government could be this focal point for the Cuban people.

Through this organization we can help develop the principles of our traditional policy of nonintervention and of self-determination for Cubans and all other subjugated countries in the Western Hemisphere. I label Russia an aggressor and a Castro ally. We feel that all forms of internal revolution could be aided by such a provisional government through the development of good will, creation of military forces, establishment of a program of sabotage, the setting up of rebel bases on adjoining islands, and the formation of a radio free Cuba.

If such a provisional government is set up it would include not only those in exile from Cuba but also those in absentia who are leading the attack from within the island. Thusly, we can help to prepare for the development of a proper democratic atmosphere for post-Castro Cuba.

V. Military surveillance: It is essential that our low-level, U-2, and high-level plane surveillance continue so that we can be prepared to meet any threat to our Nation. We feel the CIA can be more effectively used. We need constantly improving security maintenance and intelligence information. On-site missile inspection policy in Cuba has been advocated. Of additional importance is psychological warfare aimed at Soviet and Cuban troops to counteract this type of cold warfare which the Communists have used relentlessly.

VI. Western Hemisphere economic aid and education programs for underdeveloped countries: The U.S. cultural leadership and exchange programs for Western Hemisphere nations should be maintained. Students, educators, scientific, and technical personnel should continue to be exchanged. The development of democratic educational processes can be then carried out in these nations. I personally have been impressed by the Peace Corps teachers as well as privately sponsored teachers and their potential in the education systems of the Western Hemisphere countries. The great need for teachers due to the 50-percent illiteracy rate in many of the Western Hemisphere countries must be filled by us or the vacuum will be filled by Communists.

It is apparent that the Alliance for Progress with its high motives and its great beginning needs a modification of its role. It must be reoriented in order to carry out what is being discussed here. We must fully utilize communication medias for this program.

VII. Freedom Academics: Freedom Academics have been proposed—one in the United States and the other in Latin America. These academics can serve the purpose of preparing leaders and the people for the psychological impact of the fourth dimensional warfare we now face in the cold war.

VIII. Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence: The correspondence between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev during and following the October confrontation should be published to put to rest the rumors and misunderstanding in the Western Hemisphere and the world over the contents of these communications. There have been allegations of a deal having been made over Cuba.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Proposals have been made concerning the OAS. A cooperative embargo could be placed on shipping and travel to and from Cuba to prevent exportation of Communist subversion to the Western Hemisphere. This would eliminate use of Little Cayman, Grand Cayman, and other Caribbean islands for bases in Castro's scheme of exporting subversion to other Latin American countries.

The Alliance for Progress must not be considered as a substitute to direct military opposition to communism.

We should support democratic Latin American States. We should aid exiles of Communist or neo-Communist states. We should give a definitive U.S. policy and leadership to the OAS. We must show that we have the virility and the gumption to carry on a decent leadership in cooperation with other nations. We could urge the OAS to set up a quarantine of Cuba similar to that applied to the Dominican Republic under Trujillo. We could urge all Latin American nations to break off their relations with Cuba and withdraw recognition of Cuba. We feel an OAS task force could be established similar to NATO—perhaps a Latin American Treaty Organization.

This would combine all democratic nations who, like us, have the determina-

tion to keep this continent free from communism. They could act as a policing organization in conjunction with the U.S. forces. This would illustrate to these nations our willingness to cooperate and be a part of the united effort.

Today, we have also seen a comprehensive review of the bills before Congress relating to Cuba. As you will note, there are many bills. Few have come before committees or the Congress as a body. It is time we coordinated the actions of these bills. It is time that the legislative branch of Government show leadership in finding solutions to the Cuban and cold war problems.

CONCLUSION

Today, a little over 10 years since the Moncada operation in Cuba, we stand here as Members of Congress discussing the cold war in Cuba. We realize that Communists have a bastion on this island. We feel we can remove communism from there by means short of armed intervention by the United States. The alternatives are not peaceful coexistence or nuclear war. We have seen the results of appeasement in the past in the era of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo. We see the threat of such a philosophy now with British Guiana, Venezuela, Brazil, all on the threshold of capitulation to communism.

We recognize that there is risk taking involved, but the risks will be greater if we continue to procrastinate in eliminating Castro.

Action on Cuba would not split the OAS. We feel, rather, it would tend to unite Latin America behind us as they have united on other occasions, particularly in the missile crisis of October 1962. What divides these nations from us is our own indecision and inaction. This, in turn, promotes similar indecision and inaction everywhere in the hemisphere, leaving a vacuum. Our action on Cuba should reaffirm to those who are behind the Communist wall in Latin America and elsewhere that it is the policy of nonintervention and self-determination that we advocate.

The Soviets in Cuba are the interveners. They are the interlopers, the imperialists. Our objective is to give the Cubans an opportunity to express their own self-determination in national sovereignty, free of foreign domination. Under international agreements now in existence, the Rio Treaty of 1947 provided for collective self-defense. The Caracas Declaration of 1954 specifically was directed at Communists and now Resolution No. 2 of Punta del Este 1962 is our latest and most specific of all. It carries another step forward to the idea of collective self-defense contained in the Rio Treaty. It has been buried away by officialdom. We urge the administration to implement this resolution.

Finally, speaking from the floor of Congress, we who are Congressmen from both sides of the aisle, say to the people of America that the legislative branch of Government has not deserted Cuba, but is actively, deeply interested in the restoration of Cuba to the democratic

nations. We from both sides of the aisle speaking here today likewise say to those of you behind the Communist curtain of Cuba, you who have suffered, you who are fighting for democracy and feel neglected, that we are with you, that we will do all that we can to see that you are restored to your rightful place of self-determination in your Government.

We have not forgotten you. We not only want a free Cuba but we are determined to help it become free. We also say to all the nations of the Western Hemisphere that Members of the Congress are anxious and eager to develop a determined coordinated leadership by the United States. Through such a plan and policy the United States can join with you to keep this hemisphere free from communism.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to a close the special order that has been devoted to Cuba as well as the special order that preceded it of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] I should like to thank those on both sides of the aisle who participated in this discussion in order to present a bipartisan approach to a very serious problem in the Caribbean that is really only a part of a larger problem, a worldwide problem that indicates the scope and thrust of Soviet aggression and their desire for world domination through the international Communist movement.

I might point out that America has a brilliant history in the conduct of psychological warfare. In the American Revolution certainly some of the finest examples of effective psychological warfare operations were waged under the direction of such men as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. In the American Revolution the psychological warfare effort that was aimed at the members of the Hessian forces that fought under George III in the colonies was highly effective in causing desertions in the Hessian ranks.

It is very vital and necessary that we undertake a similar psychological warfare effort directed at the members of the Soviet military forces stationed on the Cuban island. Certainly this Nation that is expert in marketing and in communication can package and tell the story of the American Revolution, can create and foment unrest in the Soviet ranks and make it extremely difficult for the warlords of the Kremlin to maintain the esprit de corps and the morale of their forces in the Cuban island. It is vitally necessary we undertake such an effort aimed at subversion of the Russian troops in Cuba themselves. But even more this effort must also be directed at labeling the Soviet Union as being the real interventionist in Latin American affairs, in labeling the Soviet Union as being the first and foremost colonial power of the twentieth century, and we must remind the people of Latin America that this colonial power that now holds Cuba also holds in the Red grip the satellite nations of Europe, that it is the Soviet Union that is denying the right of self-determination to not just of the citizens of Cuba but indeed from the citizens of the satellite countries of Europe, that it is the Soviet Union that has made Cuba indeed a captive nation.

There are some of the things that we must undertake, some of the things we must do in the days and months ahead. Certainly it is our task and obligation to be certain that we preserve for our posterity the blessings of liberty. It is the obligation of the American citizens to be certain that the 20th century does not go by default to the heirs of Ghengis Khan. It shall be in this decade that we shall have cast the die of the image of society. I submit to you that no die should be cast other than the die that is in the image of the American Republic.

Ultimately the price that will be paid as the price to purchase freedom for the people who walk the streets of Havana will be the price Americans are willing to pay, but I am convinced that American citizens are willing to pay that price, that they support the declaration of October 1962, wherein it was stated that we are determined to prevent by whatever means are necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist ideas being extended throughout this hemisphere and so endangering the liberties of the peoples of the Americas. We intend to join with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination. The Cuban people are not enjoying this now because of the nature of the Communist regime which seeks to extend its slave empire, and seeks to do it by guerrilla warfare, espionage and subversion.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record a statement from the Free Cuba News, a publication of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba dated June 1, 1963, wherein this very able publication, a very sound and documented publication, points out the scope of the guerrilla effort extending from Cuba into the Latin Americas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this that the gentleman is going to insert in the Record and who prints it?

Mr. MARSH. It is pages 7 and 8 of the Free Cuba News.

Mr. HAYS. Who is the Free Cuba News? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to be accurate. Have you any information that this is anything more than propaganda from a bunch of Cubans who have an ax to grind?

Mr. MARSH. Yes; I am convinced that it is something more than that. Its editor is Daniel James, the writer. There are members of the advisory committee, such people as Adm. Arleigh Burke and other distinguished American citizens. It is simply a newsletter that is published on events occurring not only in Cuba but throughout the Latin American countries.

Mr. HAYS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what bothers me a little bit is how fast people can get to be experts on this subject when the military that has devoted a lot of study to it does not seem to know all the answers. But some of these outsiders can in a few weeks get all the answers once they get on the payroll, I

presume this writer that you are talking about is on somebody's payroll, and they can solve all the problems concerning Cuba and Russia and communism and what have you, just as long as somebody is giving them a paycheck. It is a little more difficult, I would point out to the gentleman from Virginia, when you are sitting in the driver's seat to make the decisions.

I am not going to object to the gentleman's request in this instance, Mr. Speaker, but I do point to the fact that there is a good deal of a possibility of putting things in the Record that do not have much real value and which are not very authentic. I am a little worried about putting in things from such organizations that must have an ax to grind—or they would not be in existence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Free Cuba News, June 1, 1963]

INSIDE LATIN AMERICA

CUBA OFFICIALLY PROMOTING SUBVERSION

Further evidence that the Cuban Government is openly promoting subversion in Latin America is provided by its delegate to the Fifth Labor Congress in Prague, which began May 1, where he told Communist bloc representatives that the Castro regime was dedicated to the task of overthrowing the existing governments of Latin America. The delegate, Benito Sanchez, declared that Communist Cuba was making an effort principally "to stimulate support for the people of Venezuela, Colombia and Nicaragua * * * with the aim of overthrowing the governments of those countries."

CASTRO CONSPIRACY IN ANDES

Fidel Castro made the boast not long after taking power in Cuba: "We shall convert the Cordillera of the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of South America." Stories of increasing Communist violence in the Andes, in recent weeks, indicate that the Cuban Communist dictator is making progress toward realizing his boast.

These Andean republics are feeling increasing Castro-Communist pressure:

Bolivia: This landlocked country at the "roof of South America," one of the five Latin republics that maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba, is a center of Communist arms running, espionage and subversion in the Andes. The Cuban Embassy in the capital of La Paz, according to our sources, supplies money and material aid to native and neighboring Communists. An elaborate chain of Communist way-stations, beginning in Chile, has one of its important terminuses in La Paz.

Chile: The capital of Santiago is reportedly the GHQ for Castro-Communist operations in the Andes. It is said to be headed up by two veteran Bulgarian Reds, Ivan Tenev and Konstantin Telalov, who are reportedly members of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party.

Tenev and Telalov are said to have set up a series of Red way-stations stretching into five neighboring countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador and Peru. Arms and money are funneled through the stations. Through Africa on the Chilean-Peruvian border, for example, arms are dispatched into Peru. The Africa station also connects up with La Paz, since it borders Bolivia, too.

The Cuban Embassy in Santiago, according to the Cuban Student Directorate, has more staff than its normal requirements call for and reportedly engages in the illicit arms traffic. It recently established a "Chilean-Cuban Cultural Institute" in Santiago,

which is considered a front for other cultural activities.

Peru: The existence of the Communist chain of stations in the Andes came to light through a Peruvian colonel, G. C. Victor Zapata Cesti, who captured several Communist youths when they attacked Puerto Maldonado, in southeast Peru not far from Brazil, on May 20. Col. Zapata Cesti learned that the attack was part of a Castro-Communist plan to unleash guerrilla warfare, terror and sabotage upon the area, and to initiate similar operations against Lima, the national capital, and the ancient Inca center of Cuzco.

The Communist guerrillas captured by Col. Zapata Cesti were part of a group of 69 young Peruvians who had been to Cuba for 6 months of training in guerrilla war, terrorism and sabotage under the direction of Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Castro's guerrilla expert. The roundabout way they returned to Peru from Cuba exposed the operation of the Red way-stations.

The youngsters had gone to Havana via Arica, the Chilean border town, where they were picked up by Cubana Airlines. They were sent back, however, not to Arica, Chile, but Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. From Rio the group journeyed to Sao Paulo by truck, thence to Cochabamba, in southern Bolivia, by train. They then headed for Santa Cruz, and crossed into Peru through the Beni jungle. Once in Peru they made their way to a destination called Aposento Farm, where they hired a guide to take them through more jungle and finally on to Puerto Maldonado.

The leaders of the youthful Communist band appear to have come from good social backgrounds. One, Alain Elias, is the son of a Peruvian aviation hero, Capt. Renan Elias, whose family is well-to-do. Another, Javier Heraud, who was killed, had studied at the Catholic University of Lima and had won a prize as Peru's best young poet.

Mr. MARSH. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the insertion is along the lines of the Seldon subcommittee report on Cuba, describing it as a base for subversion and espionage and as a training ground for this real threat aimed and directed at our country and the Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who have participated in this discussion for the contributions they have made here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CUBA AND THE COLD WAR

(Mr. BATTIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, because of the work I have done in the past in collecting and evaluating information on the Cuban situation, I am happy to participate in this discussion.

I have previously made several reports on the Cuban matter and would like to include excerpts from these reports.

On May 20, I spoke on the interim report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services. The recently issued interim report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services dealing with the Cuban military buildup throws light on hitherto obscure aspects

of the Cuban situation during the summer and fall of 1962. Consequently, this unanimous report of a subcommittee composed of four Democrats and three Republicans is an important first step toward better understanding of the background of American policy during that crucial period. Its appraisal of past errors and present dangers sounds an emphatic warning to those responsible for formulating policy toward Cuba.

Perhaps the most valuable part of the subcommittee's report is the enumeration of 11 considerations that lead it to conclude that Cuba now represents a grave threat to our national security. This is a needed antidote to the plethora of statements from official and unofficial spokesmen of the administration designed to minimize, and divert attention from, the seriousness of the Cuban problem.

We hope that these words of the subcommittee's report—again the unanimous judgment of its members—will be heard throughout the land:

The matter of basic and fundamental importance * * * and the source of the real threat, is that international communism now has a firm foothold in this hemisphere and that, if we permit it to do so, it is here to stay.

By (a) process of erosion our neighbors to the south may fall nation by nation until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

In a report dated June 16, I reviewed the history and implications of the Monroe Doctrine and urged a return to the positive policies of that doctrine:

Three years ago Khrushchev told the world that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, saying "the remains of this doctrine should be buried as every dead body is, so that it does not poison the air by its decay." The Eisenhower administration replied, "the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed." The Kennedy administration has so far failed to contradict Khrushchev either by word or by deed.

What is needed is the positive policy of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine is being violated by the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba—whatever their strength, whatever the nature of their equipment.

The doctrine is being violated as long as there is any type of Soviet intervention in Cuba.

The removal of Soviet troops and the elimination of other types of Soviet intervention in Cuba is an urgent policy objective.

The ultimate objective of U.S. policy must be the elimination of the Communist regime in Cuba and its replacement by a government freely chosen by the Cuban people.

In another report of July 19, I listed nations now receiving U.S. economic and/or military assistance and still carrying on trade with Cuba:

In late September 1962, the administration announced that a four-point program of restrictions on free world ships involved in the Cuban trade would shortly be put in effect. The announcement was made after months of official indecision during which the volume of free world shipping to Cuba increased drastically and freed Communist ships for the transportation of military equipment to Castro. The administration noted on October 2, 1962, that two-thirds of the ships going to Cuba were free world ships.

The announcement that a four-point program of restrictions would be imposed was late. The restrictions proposed were inadequate. And down to the present day this announcement has remained an idle threat. The only restriction on free world ships so far imposed by the Government has been the totally ineffective ban on the transportation of Government-financed cargoes from United States ports on ships in the Cuban trade.

Finally, the administration has spurned the weapon placed in its hands by Public Law 87-872, the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act of 1963, which contains two restrictions which are being ignored.

The act flatly banned any United States aid to a "country which permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba petroleum" and certain other goods of a military or strategic character.

Tankers of the following free nations which are receiving aid from the United States have traveled to Cuba in the first 6 months of 1963: United Kingdom, Greece, Italy, and Norway.

Further, the act prohibited economic aid "to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives."

Economic aid is being furnished by the United States to countries apparently in violation of this provision of the law. Inquiry made of the staff of the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives discloses that the President has not submitted to these committees the required certification.

A substantial volume of trade between Cuba and the free world continues. The most recent reliable figures, covering the calendar year 1962, place it at \$250 million or 20 percent of the entire foreign trade of Cuba. If goods for military use from the Communist bloc were eliminated from the totals, free world trade would constitute a significantly higher percentage of Cuban foreign trade.

The Government of the United States should pursue the following immediate objectives in its economic campaign against Communist Cuba:

1. Cessation of the use of free world ships to transport goods to and from Cuba.
2. Reduction of free world trade with Cuba to a negligible amount.
3. Curtailment of trade between Cuban and the Communist bloc and/or increase of the economic cost to the Communist world of supporting Castro.

The Government of the United States should take the action necessary to bring to a complete halt within the next 30 days the use of any free world ship to transport goods to or from Cuba. Such action is long overdue. Denial of free world shipping to Castro would deprive him of approximately 50 percent of the vessels that now sustain his faltering economy.

And last week, I and several of my colleagues addressed the following letter to the President in a further effort to impress those concerned with the seriousness of the Cuban matter of free world trade with Cuba.

July 24, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned Members of the House of Representatives respectfully urge that you take speedy action to

July 29

bring to an end the use of free world ships in trade with Cuba.

We are shocked to find that as much as 50 percent of the goods that sustain the economy of Communist Cuba are carried in vessels flying the flags of free nations. In the first quarter of 1963 between one-third and 40 percent of the oil that was delivered to Cuba was brought there on free world tankers.

The announced objective of your administration is the isolation of the Communist regime in Cuba. This objective is being thwarted by the use of vessels under the control of nations which are our friends and allies. The effect of such measures as have been taken to put pressure on the Cuban economy by the United States is to a considerable degree nullified by this shipping.

It should be possible to end this traffic within the next 30 days. Since the problem is largely one of persuading two nations, the United Kingdom and Greece, to withdraw their vessels from Cuban trade, a firm request by the United States should suffice. If a request is not enough, we would favor closing the ports of this country to all vessels of any nation which permits any of its ships to carry goods to or from Cuba, directly or indirectly.

May we further invite your attention to section 107 of Public Law 87-872, the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act of 1963. In conformity with this section, Mr. Joseph W. Reap of the State Department informed the press on January 11 of this year that "aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba." No action of the type promised by Mr. Reap has been taken.

You can be sure you will have the support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Congress in effective steps to terminate the use of free world ships in Cuban trade.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES F. BATTIN, WILLIAM C. CRAMER, E. ROSS ADAR, JOHN M. ASHBROOK, EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, SAMUEL L. DEVINE, EDWARD G. HALL, CLARK MACGREGOR, GARNER E. SHAFER, Members of Congress.

CUBA AND THE COLD WAR

(Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following material on Cuba:

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 1963]

DARK DECADE

It is a suggestive coincidence that the 10th anniversary of Fidel Castro's rebellion comes in the same week that the United Nations is in pitched debate over colonialism. On July 26, 1953, when Castro led the abortive attack on a military barracks that gave his movement its name, the assault was in part prompted by nationalist ideals. Cubans resented their island's semicolonial status based on sheer proximity to the United States, a one-crop economy and a tradition of Yankee paternalism.

That form of indirect colonialism has ended, but what has taken its place? Ernesto Betancourt, once Castro's July 26 representative in Washington, points out elsewhere on this page that the very terms used by the Afro-Asians to arraign Portugal can be applied to Cuba today. No longer the insolent rebel, Castro has become an apologist for a foreign capital, and his people the exposed hostage of a distant country. This new relationship was made humilitatingly clear in Castro's June 8 report in Havana on his trip to Moscow—quite possibly

the saddest and most fumbling oration of his career.

The phrases of honeyed adulation he used to describe Premier Khrushchev were worthy of an Ullrich—after all, the Soviet leader was the man who first installed and then removed missiles in Cuba, in both instances treating the island as a snafu. On economic matters, Castro rebuffed with annoyance all specific questions from his servile press panel. World sugar prices have risen over the levels paid by the Soviet Union, yet incredibly, Castro said "it was not correct" to bring the matter up with the Russians. What would he have said to any Cuban who held out a hat rather than bargain with the United States on sugar prices?

In one passage, he remarked: "At this time, it can be said that the general situation of our country is one of security—a situation of security. Security against the danger which has been besetting us since the very outset of the revolution—of a direct invasion by the United States."

With this admission, Castro knocked the ideological prop from his totalitarian state. The prisons have been filled, neighborhood spy systems set up, newspaper freedom smothered, elections denied and Cubans mercilessly shot—all on the pretext that an invasion was imminent. If Cuba is secure, why must a Soviet garrison remain on the island? Why does Castro shift his military commands so nervously and keep weapons and ammunition locked up from his militia? Why did he appoint, last week, an Eastern European Communist, Fabio Grobart, as chief of operations of the rebel army?

In the decade since July 26, 1953, much has happened which can never be undone. It would be a cruel caricature of history to suggest that Castro was always a villain and this country always the spotted lamb. Castro now talks about reconciliation. But the first requisite is a demonstration that he really speaks for his people and that his regime is not pinned together with Soviet bayonets. As a beginning, why doesn't he grant his own people some of the freedom he so solemnly promised in years gone by?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 25, 1963]

BLEAK ANNIVERSARY

The betrayal began just 10 years ago tomorrow, and it began as a failure. A young man—a crypto-Communist named Fidel Castro—headed a group of equally young "revolutionaries" in an attack on the Moncada Barracks in Santiago de Cuba. The attack, aimed at overthrowing the regime of Fulgencio Batista, was as unbelievably mismanaged as the so-called military operation that occurred a long time later at a place called the Bay of Pigs.

Yet, despite its having been a fiasco costing scores of lives, the Moncada operation—carried out on July 26, 1953—was seized upon by Fidelistas as an inspirational event. Out of it came the "July 26 Movement," under which the Cuban people were led in due course to where they are today—in the iron grip of a Communist dictatorship. This is a despotism far worse than Batista's, which, whatever its vices, had the undeniable virtue of being anti-Red, pro-West, and highly sympathetic with the United States.

It is interesting that Batista spared Fidel's life after the Moncada adventure. Certainly the situation in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere would be better today, less tense, happier, had Batista's regime dealt as harshly with Castro and his revolutionaries as those revolutionaries have dealt with Cubans who have sought to maintain their freedom. The Fidelistas, in any case, with their drumhead courts and their countless executions, have

shown a degree of cruelty—of brutishness, of contempt for the most basic norms of justice and humanity—that has never before been experienced by the Cuban people.

Above all, these people have this to lament: The July 26 Movement, in the 10 years since its bloody setback at the Moncada Barracks, has managed—not without the help of stupidities in our own country—to betray Cuba into becoming a captive of the Kremlin, which maintains about 20,000 troops and technicians on the island. The place thus is a Soviet satellite and a dangerous one. As such, it constitutes not only a thorn in the American side (or a bone in the throat, as Mr. Khrushchev would say), but also a depressing symbol of how inadequate our country can be in anticipating, evaluating and heading off just such threats as Castrolism.

Thus, is a bleak anniversary that we mark. After a decade of existence, the Castro tyranny is worse than ever, and apparently more entrenched. If any bells are to be rung to mark the birthday, they should give out the sound of a tocsin for all the Americas.

TEN YEARS AFTEA MONCADA

(Statement by Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, Inc., Washington, D.C.)

Ten years ago today, Fidel Castro led approximately 100 young Cubans in an attack on Moncada barracks, in eastern Orient Province, in what turned out to be a futile attempt to overthrow the dictatorship of Gen. Fulgencio Batista. From that day on, July 26 became a symbol of freedom for the Cuban people, and the July 26 revolutionary movement which was founded 2 years later became the vehicle through which they hoped to win their freedom.

Now, a decade later, July 26 has gone down in Cuban annals as a day of infamy, and the movement named after it has been cruelly destroyed by its very founder and inspirer, Fidel Castro. Today, the Cuban people, instead of being free are enslaved by a despotism worse than Batista's, and the chief author of their enslavement is the same Castro who launched the Moncada attack avowedly to free them.

In the speech he made at his trial following Moncada, which was later published under the title of "History Will Absolve Me," Castro laid down eight major requirements for a free Cuban society. They included the necessity for holding free elections, a free press, individual freedom (the right of habeas corpus), the restoration of the democratic 1940 constitution (which Batista had set aside), an end to rule by force and violence, an end to despotism, the exercise of self-determination, and the practice of true national sovereignty.

Castro in power has failed to fulfill a single one of his own requirements as a revolutionary. On the contrary, he has utterly negated them and has imposed upon his unhappy country the most cruel and sanguinary dictatorship the Americas have ever seen. Only a few days ago, the date of Cuba's independence, May 20, 1902—equivalent to our Fourth of July—was eradicated from Cuban history by Government decree.

At his trial, Castro said: "Cuba should be the bulwark of liberty and not the shameful abode of despotism."

He added this ringing statement: "We were born in a free country willed to us by our fathers. The island will first sink into the sea before we will consent to be the slaves of anyone."

But Cuba is today a bulwark of despotism and Cubans the slaves of a foreign power. If Castro meant what he said in 1953, let him free Cuba from the domination of Soviet imperialism and its colonial arm, the Cuban Communist Party. If he is a true patriot, he will address himself at once to the over-

riding task of expelling from his country the foreign armed forces that now occupy it.

Let him also fulfill the pledges he made at his trial to fight for the holding of free elections, for establishment of a free press, and for defending all the rights of free individuals including the right to own property and the right to habeas corpus and trial by jury. Let him restore the democratic Constitution of 1940 which sanctified those and other rights, and upheld, in particular, the right of the Cuban worker to be free and to organize into trade unions of his own choosing headed by democratically elected leaders. Let Castro end the rule of terror which he once asked Batista to end, and which has claimed many thousands of lives and warped the minds and souls of a whole generation of Cubans. Let him end the despotism of the Communist police state he has imposed upon his people. Above all, let him permit the Cuban people to exercise their self-determination and national sovereignty, by expelling all Soviet and other foreign Communist armed forces and technicians from Cuba, and then prepare the way for truly free elections under the conditions he himself proposed during the Moncada trial.

If Castro lacks the courage and conviction to carry out his revolutionary ideals, let those of his followers who still believe in them join in a concerted struggle to do so. Let the old fighters of the July 26 movement now wage war against the worst tyranny Cuba has ever known.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba calls attention to the fact that Cuba, under Castro, is a bristling fortress that menaces her Caribbean neighbors as well as the Cuban people themselves. Nearly 300,000 Cubans are today under arms, led by an estimated 30-40,000 Russians and other foreign Communists in Cuba as soldiers or military "technicians," notwithstanding Castro's many exhortations against "militarism" in the years before he took power.

In those years, he called for the "reorganization of the armed forces and the separation of same from political and partisan activities, so that the armed forces may never again be instruments of any caudillo (fuehrer) or political parties" (Aug. 20, 1958). But the Cuban armed forces today are the servant of the Communist caudillo, Castro, and of a foreign political party.

Today, these forces are employed internally to suppress the rebellious people of Cuba. But tomorrow, they may be exported to overwhelm weaker Latin countries in revolutionary warfare.

Castro justifies the militarization of Cuba on the grounds that he must defend himself against Cuban exile plots. But one must ask, why are there exiles in the first place? Let the Castro of the Moncada period answer:

"Those tens of thousands of families away from Cuba constitute a grave accusation against the bad governments that the republic has had to tolerate. We say that the problem of Cuba will be solved when the exiles can return."

How much graver is the accusation against Castro himself when one considers that, at the latest estimate, some 350,000 Cubans have had to flee their country because of his tyranny. Another 230,000 Cubans have passports and visa waivers, but lack transportation. Still another 385,000 are trying to get their immigration papers into shape. The flight of Cubans since Castro took power has no parallel in the history of the Western Hemisphere.

To add to the misery of the Cuban people under Castro, an estimated 7,000 of them have been executed by firing squads alone since he came to power, and at least 3,000

more have been killed in battle against his forces. Probably many thousands more have died in silent engagements with the secret police, the armed forces, and perhaps also the Russian occupation army. Another 80,000 to 100,000 languish in prisons and concentration camps and have doubtless given up their quota of dead to the all-consuming dictatorship.

On this 10th anniversary of the Moncada attempt, it is well to know that the full story of it has yet to be told and that authorities are still trying to piece it together and unravel the tangled skein that continues to obscure much of Fidel Castro's past.

Castro has always said publicly that he launched the Moncada attack to overthrow Batista. But there are those who contend that, rather, Castro knew in advance it would fail and deliberately intended to sacrifice lives—those of others; not his own or his brother's—in an effort to lift himself from obscurity to the national spotlight.

The famous Cuban historian and onetime University of Havana professor, Dr. Herminio Portell Vila, relates that Castro told him just before the Moncada attempt that if it involved producing a few *muertecitos*—"little corpses"—to obtain recognition of his leadership in the anti-Batista struggle, so be it. Neither Castro nor his younger brother Raul intended to be among the *muertecitos*, continues Dr. Portell Vila, because they had planned not to be in the line of fire during the attack. They took precautions, he points out, not out of cowardice but for coldly calculated political reasons.

In August 1955, Fidel Castro founded the July 26 revolutionary movement, and used it as the means to attain power. Although its public image was that of an amorphous, democratic movement composed chiefly of young students, professionals, and members of the middle class, inside it there functioned a tiny, secret group of Communists and Communist sympathizers who exercised iron control. That group was headed by the Castro brothers and Ernesto "Che" Guevara, the Argentine Communist who is now Cuba's Minister of Industry. Not long after taking power, the Castro-Guevara group began systematically destroying the July 26 movement, and today it is no more; it has been supplanted by the official United Party of the Socialist Revolution, the formal name of Cuba's Communist Party.

Today is a day of mourning in Cuba, when it should have been a day of happiness. But the Cuban people have known before, during times of struggle against other tyrannies, how to conquer adversity, and the day is not distant when that traditionally freedom-loving people will cast out their new oppressors and install a truly free government on their island once and for all.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba calls upon all Americans to do everything possible to enable the Cuban people to win their freedom. For the cause of a free Cuba is, in the last analysis, the cause of a free America.

DR. POSSONY DEMOLISHES THE OVERKILL ARGUMENT

(Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 the American Security Council's Washington Report carried a remarkably perceptive article by Dr. Stefan T. Possony which breaks directly on our military security, particularly in light of the proposed partial test ban treaty. The article is as follows:

OVERKILL: SOPHISTRY

(By Dr. Stefan T. Possony)

Among the glibberish which nowadays passes for strategic nomenclature, the word "overkill" had made a remarkable career. Originally, this term meant that too much nuclear yield was assigned to a specific target. The problem was never considered to be too significant: If the target were a city, the whole city was aimed at anyway, and the surplus yield would have been absorbed by the town's uninhabited environs. Similarly, if the target were an isolated military installation, the surplus yield would do no harm. Hence, "overkill" can result in unintended casualties only if there were an attempt to destroy specific targets within cities. If the yield placed upon an urban oil refinery, for example, were too large, the surrounding population would be killed.

With present types of nuclear weapons, a strategy of selective bombing does not seem feasible. In the future, discriminating weapons might change the situation, and clean weapons, of all yields, would considerably reduce casualties resulting from fallout. Yet nuclear progress is being hampered by the very people who are worrying about "overkill."

Recently, Seymour Melman, of Columbia University, presented a strategic overkill argument. On the basis of remarkable arithmetic, Mr. Melman thinks that almost \$23 billion can be cut from the present defense budget without impairing present capabilities: Procurement would be reduced from 16 to 10 billion; research, development and tests would be cut by 97 percent; atomic energy by 69 percent; and military construction, civil defense, and military assistance would be eliminated entirely. With about 3,400 delivery vehicles carrying about 22,000 megatons, the United States allegedly can "overkill" the Sino-Soviet bloc by 500 times, and the Soviet Union by 1,250 times. Our global overkill capability is 125 times, supposedly. How come? There are 2,000 cities with a population of over 100,000 each and a total population of 600 million including 370 cities in the bloc and 140 cities in the Soviet Union. At Hiroshima 100,000 persons were killed by a 20-kiloton weapon. If 30 percent of the U.S. delivery means fail to reach their targets, we would drop 2.5 megaton on each slice of 100,000 urban people. Thus, since only 20 kilotons are required to wipe them out, we would "overkill" these target populations by 125 times; similar arithmetic "discloses" our overkill capabilities against the Communists.

It is not explained whether the "overkill" makes any difference to the casualties. Whether a soldier is killed by a bullet or a 16 inch "overkill" shell, hardly is a cause of worry. Reducing the average yield from 2.5 megatons to 20 kilotons, far from saving anything, would be quite expensive. To preserve adequate assurance of hit, as yield is being reduced, the number of shots would have to be increased. For example, against a 5 PSI target and with an accuracy of 3,000 feet CEP, 4 missiles with 20-kiloton warheads would have to be launched to achieve full assurance of destruction, or 2 missiles to achieve a probability of 92 percent. With a 2-megaton warhead, just one missile is needed. But let us disregard such vexing "details."

This much is certainly true. If 3,400 weapons with a yield of several megatons each were dropped on the surprised and unprotected populations of every city, millions of people would be killed. But what strategy would be directed toward ticking off one town after the other around the globe or even in enemy countries? It is ridiculous to calculate military requirements in this fashion. If we had applied this sort of calculation to

12850

estimate how much ammunition we needed to win World War II, someone could have deduced that not more than 200,000 tons of steel were required.

According to Mr. Melman's sources, the United States has 1,300 strategic bombers, 1,150 Navy bombers, and 940 strategic missiles. The Soviet Union has 200 long range and 1,400 medium range bombers, 85 ICBM's, 700 MRBM's, and 100-200 submarine-launched missiles. Weapons of a more tactical nature were ignored. Naturally, the Soviet Union hardly will risk a war with the United States, so long as they can threaten us merely with 85 initial ICBM's and 200 bombers. Since Europe according to this battle order, rates 700 MRBM's, it would seem self-evident that the United States must rate about 1,000 ICBM's; but let us assume that the Soviets prepare for us only 300 ICBM's. For the United States to be able to use strategic bombers which carry the main punch, defense suppression is mandatory. Suppose there are in the Soviet Union about 750 ground-to-air and antimissile rocket sites; add to those 300 ICBM's, 700 MRBM's and perhaps 100 airbases; this totals 1,850 targets. If those targets were moderately hardened (30 p.s.i. on the average), and if they are to be destroyed by airbursts, then two shots with 2 megaton warheads would have to be used against each target to destroy it with a probability of 90 percent; 3 shots would give a probability of 97 percent. If we decide to attack the ICBM and MRBM sites with two weapons each and the other targets with one weapon, the requirement would be 2,850 weapons on target or 3,700 weapons on the pad.

However, according to Mr. Melman, we possess but 940 missiles. This would allow us to place only about 650 missiles on target, just enough to take care of the Soviet ICBM's and of about 50 defense suppression targets. Certainly, some aircraft might break through without benefit of previous defense suppression. But so long as the Soviet ground-to-air missiles are not knocked out, these bombers would find it difficult to demolish Soviet cities systematically. Even if they were successful, in the interim Europe would have been struck by 700 MRBM's.

If the Soviets strike the first blow, their stipulated 300 ICBM's might knock out 150 American ICBM's. Disregarding the damage done in the United States by the Soviet strike, we could then send about 400 ICBM's against a mixture of defense suppression targets and airbases. Paradoxically, in this situation our aircraft would have somewhat greater freedom of operations than in the first strike case. But we still would possess precious little power to do anything about the 700-odd MRBM's which could hold virtually all European cities as hostages; and we would not have too much punch to prevent the Soviet army from seizing Western Europe. Certainly, our tactical nuclear forces might enter into the breach, but the overall situation would be much worse if the Soviets were to acquire effective antimissile defenses, as they undoubtedly will. In brief, our forces do not have, in any shape, form, or manner, an overkill capability. On the contrary, the best that can be said about our present posture is that it leaves Europe (and Japan) unprotected.

Continuous research and development and procurement are hardly needed to add to our "overkill" capability. Granted that 22,000 megatons is a great deal of firepower (actually, Professor Melman overlooked that airplanes if they can "live" in the hostile environment, are capable of more than a single mission). But such a figure standing by itself, is meaningless. How hard are the targets? How effective are the means of delivery and defense? What is the accuracy of delivery and how good is the target intelligence? How many of the targets are fixed or

mobile? And so on. With 22,000 megatons, no less than 100,000 towns could be "Hiroshimized," if we had the requisite delivery system; but the same firepower, if it can be delivered according to target specifications, is just about enough to take care of 1,000 missile sites.

Continuous procurement is needed to equip our forces with new weapons, not to increase our firepower. The B-47's which, in Mr. Melman's calculations, account for 6,000 megatons are being phased out. There is no replacement for the B-52 which is credited with a 12,000 megaton punch. Simple arithmetic shows that if we want to maintain our firepower, while replacing bombers by Minuteman, we must substitute about 18,000 Minuteman missiles for the B-47's and B-52's. Since we are not planning to do this, our kill capability is being reduced. Continuing research and development and procurement also are mandatory, to achieve antimissile defense capabilities, and to enable our forces in Europe, as well as our allies, to acquire offensive and defensive weapons in order to balance the Soviet MRBM and medium bomber threat. Unless our weapons are modernized constantly, we will lose our military power and the "overkill" capability will be owned by the enemy exclusively. Our difficulty is not that we possess an imaginary overkill capability but that in the face of the growing Soviet threat, our military strengths and deterrent powers are declining. Let us hope, to paraphrase Burke, that the sophists and calculators will not extinguish the glory of America and Europe.

Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BERRY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MARCH BY COLORED CITIZENS ON CAPITOL HILL, AUGUST 28

Mr. SILER (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite generally understood that a large delegation, about 100,000 people, I believe, consisting of our colored citizens, will march to the Capitol on August 28 in the interest of civil rights legislation.

Now about the time when this plan was first announced one of our Democratic Senators stated publicly that if such a delegation should come to his office, he, the Senator, would himself physically and personally eject them from his office.

Having lived among colored people all my life and having helped them and served them on many occasions, I want to say that none of them will be ejected from my office or mistreated in any way whatsoever. On the contrary, they will be most welcome and will receive my personal greetings as well as my utmost respect. Of course, I hope some of these visitors will be from my own congressional district or at least from my State of Kentucky. But regardless of where they may live, they will be treated with real courtesy, kindness, and civility. I will plan to meet the situation in this specific manner:

First, I will have coffee and doughnuts served to my colored guests.

Second, if any of them are here without means for a night's lodging, I will offer to pay for lodging for my guests.

Third, if my guests have a minister among them, I will call on him for a prayer for our Nation and all of its people of all races and creeds.

Fourth, if my guests have some singers among them, I will call on them for some spirituals or some other good songs.

I guarantee you that we will have such a good time together that they will all have cause to say "this is about the whitest white man we have been with for some time."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I must in all fairness to you and to my prospective guests say right now that I will not vote for any civil rights bill that undertakes to consider every private business out on the main streets of America as some sort of an interstate commerce enterprise or that undertakes to make Bobby Kennedy the policeman of our entire Nation with power to run the private affairs of John Q. Public while the latter is operating his own establishment. Such a bill would not encompass freedom, nor Americanism nor the best interests of our country. So, while I promise to our colored friends on August 28 warm hospitality, yet I do not promise them the unconstitutionality of a bill that may come before us in the House of Representatives as now proposed by Bobby Kennedy.

TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD, I wish to include my current Washington report on the subject of the pending nuclear test ban treaty.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

The U.S. Senate will soon be debating the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. Adoption of this treaty by the United States would be one of the most dangerous steps it has ever taken.

It seems paradoxical than an apparent step toward peace lays the groundwork for nuclear destruction of the American people. Our citizens have been conditioned by massive propaganda to believe that a test ban treaty is the only alternative to annihilation. With this conditioning, they are then supposed to urge their Senators to adopt this treaty. The American public has been prevented from knowing the truth by reason of highly managed news based on three erroneous concepts: First, the subject is too secret to trust you with; second it is too complex for you to understand; and third, it is too incredible for you to believe.

Russia has violated 51 of its 53 treaties, and why should we believe that it has any intention to keeping this treaty? The leopard has not changed its spots. Khrushchev still intends to bury us. The open conflict between Russia and Red China is being used to persuade America that the "Butcher of Budapest" is really a good guy. The break with China is simply over whether or not America should be destroyed before dinner or after dinner. The end result is the same. International communism has developed into a German-Panzer type of